

Also, a bill (H. R. 12547) to authorize the payment of the sum of \$2,500 to the dependents of the officers and men who lost their lives on the submarine S-4; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12548) for the relief of R. T. Boatright; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 12549) granting an increase of pension to Estline Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12550) granting an increase of pension to Annie A. Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12551) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12552) granting an increase of pension to William Hays; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 12553) for the relief of Samuel J. Swain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 577) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point Maximo Mariano Pruna y Hernandez, a citizen of Cuba; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10810. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by Joe Shea, 6034 Carlsbad Avenue, St. Louis, Mo., and many other citizens of St. Louis, favoring the passage of House bill 7122, providing for pensions for adult blind persons; to the Committee on Pensions.

10811. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44, U. C. L. M. I. U. of N. A., urging enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees with a set-up of national and local machinery and with employees' representation thereon through a recognized union representative as outlined in the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10812. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of the New York Adult Blind Association, Inc., requesting the passage of House bill 7122; to the Committee on Pensions.

10813. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44, U. C. L. M. I. U. of N. A., endorsing and requesting enactment of legislation for the creation of a court of appeals for civil-service employees as outlined in House bill 9258; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10814. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the United Upholsterers' Union of New York, Local No. 44, concerning the enactment of legislation creating a civil-service court of appeals as provided in the Pearson bill (H. R. 9258); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

10815. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 1, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we wait again in prayer to hear Thy changeless voice and to see the unvarying face of our Father in Heaven; we lift the cross against a radiant sky. Thou art the author and impulse of every good work, and we would league ourselves with Thee. Be Thou the inspiration of our thoughts; wield Thy scepter and they will lose their weakness; enfold them and they will banish fear; conquer them and they will be courageous. We pray that we may draw from a vision of Thee an intolerance of wrong and a love for righteousness. Impress us, blessed Lord, with the abiding

LXXX—411

truth: He who serves Thee with a good and upright heart will find in Thee his peace when the day is far spent. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12098) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9244. An act providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida at Panama City, Fla.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3154. An act making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo-advertising allowances, to provide a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases, and to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys from exploitation by unfair competitors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by including two articles by Bob McCormick on resettlement. They are very short articles.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is Bob McCormick?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. He is a writer on the Washington Daily News.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the reading of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 30, 1936.

HON. JOSEPH W. BYRNS,

Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign as a member of the Committee on Patents, effective this date.

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES J. COLDEN, M. C.,
Seventeenth District, California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 501

Resolved, That CHARLES J. COLDEN, of California, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report (Rept. No. 2574) on the bill (H. R. 12098) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withdraw that for a moment until I can prefer a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WITHROW. I will withhold it temporarily.

WASTE AND TAXES

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a radio address delivered last night by my colleague from Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address of Hon. ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan, over Columbia Broadcasting System April 30, 1936:

Ladies and gentlemen, the demand from the White House that Congress repeal the corporation income tax, the capital-stock tax, and the excess-profits tax which, according to the Treasury officials would have yielded \$1,100,000,000 this year, and enact in their place other taxes of acknowledged uncertain productivity, but which are hoped to raise \$600,000,000 more than this sum, placing upon the shoulders of the already overburdened taxpayers this additional tax burden, brings more sharply to the attention of the public the profligate way in which the national substance is being dissipated by the administration.

It reminds us again, and vividly, of the many promises of economy and good government with which we were regaled when Franklin D. Roosevelt was campaigning for the high office he now holds.

It reminds us also of the provisions of the platform of the Democratic Party in 1932, to which their Presidential candidate swore unswerving fealty. The American people believe, and have a right to believe, that a party platform embodies a program of legislative and executive action which will be followed scrupulously in the event the party wins the approval of the electorate.

The platform should be, and must be if our institutions are to stand, an inviolable pact with the people. They should hold to the strictest accountability any party or any individual who willfully and flagrantly violates the pact.

By examining the pledges of the Democratic platform and candidate of 1932, and by comparing them with actual performance after the party and candidate had received at the hands of the people an unmistakable mandate to carry out those pledges, we can determine for ourselves whether the covenant has been kept, and whether there has been that scrupulous regard for that platform and those personal pledges which the people of this country have every right to expect.

Another Presidential election approaches, and mere prudence should cause us to examine our most recent administrative history. We should examine the books and cast a balance. Things which have been promised, things which have been done, which are now being done, and which appear to be indicated in the event the present administration should be returned to power, should be examined under the cold light of fact. It is only in this way we can learn whither we are going, what the price of the indicated economic joy ride promises to be, and whether we are willing to pay the price.

The Democratic platform of 1932, among other things, declared:

"We believe that a party platform is a covenant with the people, to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power, and that the people are entitled to know in plain words the terms of the contract to which they are asked to subscribe."

It also declared:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

That Mr. Roosevelt agreed, especially with the latter plank of their platform was evidenced while making an appeal for the support of the people of Iowa at Sioux City on September 29, 1932, when he said:

"I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all history—one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and the reduced earning power of our people. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer."

Mr. Roosevelt continued:

"Later in this campaign I propose to analyze the enormous increase in the growth of bureaucracy. We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington; or, to put it another way around, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services which are neither practical or necessary."

Three weeks before election Mr. Roosevelt announced:

"Before any man enters my Cabinet he must give me a twofold pledge of—

"First. Absolute loyalty to the Democratic platform, and especially to its economy plank.

"Second. Complete cooperation with me, looking to economy and reorganization in his department."

He continued:

"I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues in this campaign. In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that government can make to business."

The extravagance Mr. Roosevelt complained about can be determined by an examination of the public records. They will disclose that for the year ending June 30, 1931, under the Republican administration Congress appropriated \$3,591,604,616. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, Congress appropriated \$3,868,731,286. These must have been the appropriations to which his remarks were directed.

The Government cannot spend until after Congress has appropriated. The figures just mentioned were the limit of expenditures for those years, and it was this spending which so alarmed the Democratic candidate. To carry out his pledge to the people to reduce the spending of the Government 25 percent, it would have been necessary for him to have reduced the yearly expenditures to an average of \$2,897,625,959. That was in effect the promise he made to the people of these United States.

Remember, please, that we were in the depths of the depression. The conditions existing at the time he made his campaign were precisely what they were when he was inaugurated. He must have known of the unemployment existing. He surely knew of the suffering among our people. He certainly was not unaware of the appropriations made by the Republican administration from which to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. He at that time must have known the necessity for such appropriations.

It was common knowledge that food and clothing, provided from the Treasury of the United States, were being distributed to the needy by the American Red Cross, working through its local representatives, without expense to the Treasury for such distribution. He must have known this was being done. Mr. Roosevelt must have realized that a sympathetic administration was increasing the governmental expense in order to supply the needs of unfortunate citizens whose needs could not be fully supplied by the local authorities. He knew then, and he knows now, that not the slightest hint of politics crept into the distribution of relief to the poor under that Republican administration. The American Red Cross cannot be charged with playing politics with human misery. He knew spending for relief must continue. All this he knew, and yet he promised to reduce the Government expense 25 percent.

Now, let us examine the performance. Let us see if those promises have been kept. What were the appropriations for the first year of Mr. Roosevelt's administration? Yes; what will they have been for the 4 years when this session adjourns and all appropriation bills will have become the law and the record established for which his administration is responsible? Listen, my friends, while I give you the sad news:

Appropriations	
Congress appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934.....	\$7,102,000,000
Congress appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935.....	8,581,000,000
Congress appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936.....	10,350,000,000
Congress will have appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937.....	8,395,000,000
Four years' total.....	34,428,000,000

When we speak of billions, we are dealing in sums so huge as to be beyond the comprehension of human minds. It is only by comparison that we can even begin to realize just what they mean.

The United States Government declared war with Germany on the 7th day of April 1917. We were officially at war with that country until July 2, 1921. During that more than 4 years of war, and during which we squandered and wasted like a nation of drunken sailors, and during which we had in the field four and one-half million soldiers, half of whom saw service in Europe, it cost the United States for all civil and war expense the immense sum of \$26,000,000,000. This does not include the more than ten billions we loaned our Allies, which the American taxpayers must pay. This, by the way, seems in retrospect to be the familiar Democratic manifestation of the policy of "the good neighbor."

It is interesting to note, particularly in view of the criticism hurled at a previous administration and the promises of economy on the part of the present one, that 4 years of Roosevelt during peacetimes will cost the American taxpayers \$8,428,000,000 more than it cost them during the more than 4 years of war under Wilson.

Further, it is also interesting to note the expense of running the Government during the first 124 years of the national existence. From Washington's first inauguration to Wilson's first inauguration, during which time we paid in part the expense of the Revolu-

tionary War; during which time we fought and paid for the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Indian wars, the Civil War, and the Spanish War and paid all other expenses of government, the cost to the taxpayers all down those 124 years was only \$24,340,000,000, or \$10,078,000,000 less than Mr. Roosevelt has asked for and received in a little more than 3 years at the hands of this accommodating Democratic Congress.

What has become of his promised economy? How does his spending compare with that of the previous administration, of which he so loudly complained? How does his record in this respect compare with that of his predecessor? The records show that he is spending far more than double the amount. Now the questions arise: How is he spending all this money? What has he done about abolishing useless bureaus and commissions, eliminating extravagance, etc.? Let us examine the facts:

There are today so many new alphabetical set-ups in the city of Washington that I doubt even the President himself knows what they all are, or what they are supposed to do. There are 43 different agencies of the Government spending relief money. Twenty-two of these agencies are of the New Deal, alphabetical, "brain trust" variety, of which the best known, the most extravagant, the most unjustified, the most useless is the Resettlement Administration headed by Prof. Rexford Guy Tugwell.

Verification of this statement can be had from a report of its activities furnished the Ways and Means Committee by Professor Tugwell himself, during the recent hearings on the tax bill, and from an employee of the Resettlement Administration who, of course, belongs to the Democratic Party, otherwise he would not have the job he holds. The latter information came to me not long ago in the form of a letter, which I quote in part as follows:

"We have winked at spending thousands until at last the music must be faced.

"Why not begin in sincerity by trimming some of the useless and worthless agencies? And for the sake of common decency begin with the Resettlement Administration, where—

"First. The Administration pay roll has reached \$2,000,000 per month.

"Second. Thirteen thousand chair warmers are doing and duplicating each others' work, and nearly all of it useless work.

"Third. Eight hundred and ninety-four persons in the Administration engaged in 'management', but so far no one has been able to find out what they manage.

"Fourth. More than 3,500 employees of Resettlement are receiving salaries in excess of civil-service ratings, all because they have pull and friends.

"Fifth. The Administration's Construction Division is spending for labor to the tune of \$30,000 per day—enough to build at least 10 low-cost houses, but does not build 10 houses a month.

"Sixth. Hundreds of the higher-salaried employees know that they are on dignified relief, but why dish out relief at the rate of \$2,500 to \$5,000 per year per person?

"Seventh. Of all the headaches the present administration will have will be the one when the public finds out what a disorganized, far-flung, wasteful agency the Resettlement is.

"Eighth. You may be interested in knowing that many have left the Resettlement to save their self-respect, and the writer of this will do so soon."

The Resettlement Administration is the agency referred to as "Utopia unlimited" in a series of articles appearing recently in the Washington Post. It is an agency established without specific authorization of Congress and was brought into existence by Executive order of the President. To this activity—or shall I say "inactivity"—has been allocated by the President the staggering sum of \$278,347,171.29. Professor Tugwell has employed, according to his report, 16,943 persons, at an aggregate expense to the taxpayers each year of \$24,380,985 for salaries alone.

As nearly as we can gather from the sentimental and gushing pronouncements regarding its origin and purposes, emanating from its publicity division, the philosophy pursued is that by shifting people around from where they are to where Dr. Tugwell thinks they ought to be, somehow in the process the subjects of his experimentation will realize the "more abundant life."

An illustration of this theory working out in practice is seen in the Matanuska Valley project in Alaska, involving transfer of 200 families from Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, where they had established themselves, to the rim of the Arctic Circle, where they were allotted farms of 40 acres per family upon which they, I understand, assumed mortgages of \$6,000 each, not one of which can ever be paid, even in part, but where, according to the "brain trusters", agricultural conditions are almost ideal.

To date the Government has spent approximately \$18,000 per family. Not a crop has been raised, and already 33 families have thrown up their hands, given it up as a bad job, and have returned home. The remainder of them will undoubtedly follow in the near future.

The Matanuska experiment is only one of many under way. Information coming to us regarding these other projects is replete with instances of similar unsatisfactory conditions which point to ultimate failure, with the result of shocking waste of the public funds, with no permanent benefit to anyone.

An even more startling discrepancy between the cost to the taxpayers and the benefits to the recipients of the favors being spread around greets the inquirer who looks into the fiscal affairs of Professor Tugwell's administration. Administrative costs have been, according to the best information I can secure, \$13,000 to provide benefits to the needy of less than \$2,500. The reason for this is vividly set forth in the letter from which I quoted earlier in my remarks. This would seem to indicate that the "relief"

extended by this agency is confined principally to the "relief" extended to those upon the Resettlement pay roll.

The daily statement of the United States Treasury, dated April 20, 1936, disclosed the fact that of the money allocated to the Resettlement Administration, there was of that date the sum of \$173,646,075.56 unexpended. If the President is really desirous of securing the amount of money called for by him, which, of course, the pending tax bill will not provide, I suggest he issue an Executive order putting an end to the fantastic activities of the Resettlement Administration, discharge Professor Tugwell himself and all his 16,943 assistants, and cover back into the Treasury's general fund the \$173,646,000 while this sum is still unexpended and available.

There's a well-known axiom that "a dollar saved is a dollar earned." Here is an opportunity to actually secure this magnificent sum of money without delay, and without taxing our people in this amount. I commend this suggestion to the earnest consideration of the President of the United States.

There are many other activities of the administration, entirely without legislative sanction, involving the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars, of no economic need or benefit, and which cannot be justified.

The ridiculous limits to which the administration is going in its squandering and waste of public funds is indicated by the allocation to the States of a sum approximating \$60,000,000 to be used for recreation.

Every dollar the Government spends, or ever will spend, must necessarily come from the pockets of the American taxpayer. There is no other source from which it can come. Money, if it is to have value, must be earned by someone in the process of the production of wealth. Taxes must be paid from income. A dollar spent for taxes cannot also be spent for bread or meat. Because of this, whenever taxes are increased the standard of living is lowered accordingly.

Government debts must be paid, principal and interest. They represent taxes.

When we Republicans took over the control of Government from the Democratic Party in 1921 the national debt was 26 billions, in round numbers. When the Democrats were returned to control on March 4, 1933, the national debt had been reduced by the Republican administrations to \$20,968,391,487.

The daily statement of the United States Treasury dated April 23, 1936, gives the national debt as of that day as \$31,437,665,170.38. All of which indicates that the promises of economy, which carried with them implications of reduced national debt, made when seeking the approval of the electorate, have long since been forgotten, with the result that the national debt has been increased in the amount of \$10,499,274,683.38 in a little more than 3 years of this Roosevelt administration, notwithstanding increased taxes during this period. And the end is not yet by any means.

Calvin Coolidge at one time said:

"There is scarcely an economic ill anywhere in our country that cannot be traced directly or indirectly to high taxes. To increase that burden is to disregard the general welfare. Through constructive economy, to decrease taxes is to enlarge the reward of everyone who toils."

President Roosevelt at Pittsburgh on October 19, 1932, in discussing costs of government and the necessity for economy in expenditures, referring to the burdens unnecessarily thrust upon our people through unwise Government spending, made this statement:

"Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from their wages, in increased costs of what they buy, or (as now) in broad cessation of employment. There is not an unemployed man, there is not a struggling farmer, whose interest in this subject is not direct and vital."

In the face of all this, in the face of the fact that the extravagances and waste now taking place are thrusting upon the shoulders of generations yet unborn tax burdens under which they must stagger throughout their lives; the extravagances and waste go on, and the Democratic leadership has the effrontery to solicit the support of the youth of today, who, with their children and their children's grandchildren, will be called upon to pay a tremendous price for this governmental joyride.

Necessary relief must be carried on, of course, but all this can be done without adding to the public pay rolls hundreds of thousands to administer this relief, by the simple expedient of turning relief administration over to the States and their agencies, which are already established and which are much closer to the people and to the problems presented.

Certainly in the expenditure of the taxpayers' money for public works in order to provide relief some regard should be shown for the necessity of the project. We should at least attempt to secure a dollar's worth for every dollar spent. In every community in this country there are schools which should be built, roads constructed, grade crossings built in order to protect the lives and property of our people, sewers built and extended, that the health of our communities may be further secured. There are other projects which can be undertaken with the knowledge that the coming generations, who will be called upon to pay much the larger part for all this, will receive some benefit from these expenditures. Work projects should be confined to activities of this character.

Nor should there be begun nor finished other projects, such as the Florida ship canal or the automobile highway now being built down the Florida Keys without the contribution of a single penny by the State of Florida, and about which no information can be

secured in the city of Washington, but which will cost many millions of dollars of the money of the people of all the States.

The usefulness of the canal, if it is ever completed, will never be such as to even in small part justify its cost, if the opinion of shipping officials can be relied upon.

Passamaquoddy, the economic joke of all the many economic jokes of this administration, which the President, after allocating several million dollars for its development out of the four billion eight hundred and eighty million the Congress so obligingly placed in his hands, has dumped the whole proposition into the lap of Congress and is now demanding that we accept the responsibility and furnish the funds for its completion. Congress has wisely declined to do this.

I think my audience will all remember the avidity with which the administration seized upon the creation of the great "shelterbelt" of forest a hundred miles wide and running north and south for 1,100 miles through the prairie States. Presenting as it did another funnel through which could be poured into the administration's economic ashcan many other hundred millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, it was received with enthusiastic acclaim by the spenders of the administration. This proposal, accepted without investigation and without the realization that a shelterbelt of trees even a hundred miles wide would furnish little protection to that great expanse of prairie land, was heralded as the solution of the dust storms which have so sorely beset that section of the country in the last few years. Fortunately for the taxpayers, and before much money had been expended, the difficulties of making trees grow in that land, upon which trees had never grown, together with the belated realization of the utter absurdity of the whole thing, became so apparent that it evidently has been abandoned.

Other activities of the administration, both unwise and expensive, should, it seems to me, be given consideration at a time when Congress is considering a proposition of further increasing the tax upon our people. Certainly we who are sent here from the four corners of this great land to protect the economic welfare of the people who send us here, should not in the slightest degree unnecessarily increase the burdens of those whom we represent. If by properly conserving the money already at our disposal, if by eliminating every expense not necessary to our economic life and future, if by eliminating boondoggling and other useless, senseless activities, if by refusing at this time to construct great works at a cost of hundreds of millions in the mere hope that in the dim and distant future they may contribute to the economic welfare; if by doing these things we may meet the financial obligations of the Nation without adding to the tax burdens of our constituents, should we not do so?

One cannot address himself to this subject, it seems to me, and bring every relevant thing into the picture in the time at my disposal. I wish I had time to refer at some length to certain activities now being engaged in by the administration, which vitally affect the everyday life and the economic welfare of the great agricultural class of the country. I shall do so briefly.

It is conceded by every informed person, I think, that upon the welfare of the farmers depends in large degree the welfare of all other classes of our citizens.

That the administration appears to recognize this fact seems to be indicated by some of the things that have been done in the name of agricultural relief. However, certain other things have been and are now being done which more than offset all the benefits the American farmer may have received through the medium of the A. A. A. contracts.

I refer to two things: First. While with one hand we have been taxing our people on the very necessities of life, through the processing taxes, to raise the money with which to pay the farmers for taking millions of acres of good American farm land out of production, we have, with the other hand, been spending hundreds of millions for great irrigation works in the West to bring into production and into competition with farms already in existence, other millions of acres, which up to this time have produced nothing of agricultural value.

These lands are valuable, of course. There is no question but that they will be needed in the distant future when our population shall have increased to the point where the farms now available and now producing can no longer supply the food necessities of our people. But how can we justify taxing our people, taxing our already overburdened farmers, if you please, in order that we may bring into existence these great irrigation projects which can only intensify the almost insurmountable difficulties which already face our farmers?

Second, is the problem presented to the farmers and to the country by the so-called reciprocal trade agreement, under which we are surrendering our markets to the foreign producer. A study of the records for the last year discloses the tremendous increase in imports of farm and other products, while at the same time there was a substantial reduction in our exports. There was a shockingly large increase in our imports of agricultural commodities. Certainly any program which permits the farmer to be assailed upon the one hand by the competition of an always increasing number of irrigation projects, which he is taxed to pay for, and upon the other hand by the competition of constantly increasing importation of foreign agricultural products with their low cost of production can hardly be considered a program wholly in his interests.

The public is supposed to believe that the purpose and effect of this tax bill is to force net earnings out of the treasuries of the corporations into the pockets of the rich, thereby forcing those with large incomes into higher income-tax brackets and compelling them to pay a much larger share of the tax of the country than

they have heretofore paid. It will not have this effect for reasons I shall now present.

The income tax, with its exemptions and its graduated scale of taxation is, in my judgment, the fairest tax that has yet been devised. Its purpose, of course, is to compel every taxpayer to pay in proportion to his ability to pay. It has been successfully applied up to a certain point. Unfortunately, the existence of tax-exempt bonds of the Federal Government, the States, and all political subdivisions of the States present an avenue of escape for taxpayers in the higher surtax brackets, thereby preventing the application of the tax upon the very wealthy in full measure.

For instance, a taxable income of \$250,000 represents an investment of \$4,333,333 in business and productive enterprise at a dividend rate of 6 percent. The income tax on this \$250,000 is \$128,294. This sum subtracted from the \$250,000 leaves a balance or net income of \$121,706 on the investment. The same sum invested in tax-exempt securities at 3½ percent would net the taxpayer \$143,892, or \$22,186 more than he would receive if he should leave his money invested in enterprises which provide jobs for American wage earners. In other words, the present conditions, and the availability of tax-exempt securities as an avenue of investment, present to the taxpayer with this amount of money to invest an inducement of \$22,186 per year to invest his money in tax-exempt bonds. The larger the sum available for investment, the larger the inducement to the taxpayer to take his money out of productive enterprise, as is shown by the following table:

Taxable income derived from investment at 6 percent	Tax	Net income after tax	Yield from investment of same capital in 3½-percent bonds	Inducement to invest in tax-exempt bonds
\$250,000.....	\$128,294	\$121,706	\$143,892	\$22,186
\$500,000.....	304,144	195,856	291,666	95,810
\$1,000,000.....	679,044	320,956	583,333	262,377
\$2,000,000.....	1,449,019	550,981	1,666,666	1,115,685
\$5,000,000.....	3,788,994	1,211,006	2,916,666	1,705,660
\$10,000,000.....	7,738,994	2,261,006	6,866,006	4,604,994

There is another inducement which the prudent investor rarely overlooks, and that is the fact that there are none of the hazards of business connected with investment in carefully selected tax-exempt securities. The result of this situation is that by far the larger number of the more wealthy citizens do not today have their money invested in corporations or other business, the income from which would be subjected to the higher income-tax brackets. A certain amount is so invested, yes; but when it becomes profitable to enter the avenue of tax escape through this other line of investment, the way is open and the hand of economy, frugality, thrift, careful management of resources, selfishness—whatever you care to call it—beckons and the taxpayer enters.

There is nothing the Congress can do about this so long as it remains possible for the Federal Government, the States, and the subdivisions of the States to issue bonds and other securities, the income from which is immune from taxation. Neither the measure before Congress at this time nor any other law the Congress can enact can in itself change this situation. The 48 States of this Union constitute the only authority which can put an end to this intolerable condition. And they can do so only after the Congress has adopted and sent to them a constitutional amendment correcting this situation.

At different times, before and since the inauguration of President Roosevelt, he has directed attention to this situation and made note of the fact that many of our more wealthy people were, through this medium, escaping their fair share of the national tax burden.

In his tax message of June 19, 1935, he made the following statement:

"I renew, however, at this time the recommendations made by my predecessors for the submission and ratification of a constitutional amendment whereby the Federal Government will be permitted to tax the income on subsequently issued State and local securities, and likewise for the taxation by the State and local governments of future issues of Federal securities."

At the time the President sent his message to Congress the law provided a maximum of 55-percent surtax on individual incomes. That he was fully alive to the ineffectiveness of the higher surtaxes is indicated by his statement quoted above. And yet in that same message he stated:

"The disturbing effect upon our national life that come from great inheritances of wealth and power can in the future be reduced, not only through the method I have just described, but through a definite increase in the taxes now levied upon very great individual net incomes."

He knew, of course, that surtaxes as high as 55 percent were ineffective; that they had already driven hundreds of the larger-income owners into the tax-exempt field; that we were not even then securing the amount of revenue from the rich we had every right to expect; he must have known that to further raise the surtaxes to 75 percent, as was done in the bill he requested, before a constitutional amendment had been submitted to and adopted by the States would result in driving hundreds of others to the protection of the tax-exempt field of investment, with a consequent loss to the Treasury.

But that bill, my friends, was to be known to all and sundry as the great Roosevelt soak-the-rich tax bill; the uninformed were

to be convinced that the millennium had arrived and that at last this class were to be compelled to bear their share of this tax burden. To convince them of this it was necessary that the surtaxes be again boosted, so that the orators of the party could go forth in the following election and make their campaigns upon this false premise.

The last two Congresses have not without ample cause become known as rubber-stamp Congresses. Our friends on the other side have, without exception, speedily enacted every measure seriously suggested to them by the President of the United States. There has been no time when rebellion in their ranks, regardless of their personal opinions, has in the slightest degree threatened the enactment of even one of the well-known "must" measures. The President knows this. I am sure he has a high appreciation of the splendid cooperation he has received at the hands of his Democratic Congress. I am sure, also, that he is fully aware that if he were to seriously ask the leaders of the House and the leaders of the Senate to put through the two Houses of Congress a resolution submitting to the States the constitutional amendment mentioned above, it would be done immediately.

Representative TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, 10 long years ago introduced a resolution providing for this constitutional amendment. He has reintroduced it in each succeeding Congress. It is now reposing quietly in the Judiciary Committee of the House, and, notwithstanding frequent urgings, the committee has, up to this time, declined to even hold hearings on the resolution.

Does anyone doubt that should the President ask for the immediate consideration of this resolution that the amiable, distinguished Democratic chairman of that great committee would for one instant refuse such a request? We all know he would not. So what are we waiting for? Why aren't we doing the thing we so clearly should do? Why doesn't the President send up a "must" message on the subject if he is seriously in earnest about this matter? Why isn't this done now, in order that the principle of the graduated income tax may apply to all alike? It hasn't been done up to now and I am satisfied it will not be done during this administration. Why it is not done I shall leave to our Democratic friends to explain.

The tax bill now before Congress is another measure similar to the one of 1935, in that it also is designed to convince the uninformed that through this medium we are going to "soak the rich."

Every Member of Congress should know that the tax on the rich will not be increased as a result of the bill. If there should be an increase of revenue resulting from the enactment of the bill, it necessarily follows that this increased tax will be paid by those other than the rich.

Representative TABER, of New York, disclosed many ways in which revenue can be saved and not cripple any legitimate function of government, nor withhold any necessary money for relief. I have suggested others. Courageous, intelligent action along the lines suggested will make unnecessary any tax bill at this time. Such action would enable us to more nearly approach a balanced Budget than the bill before us, even though the revenue it produces far exceeds the fondest hopes of its proponents.

The seriousness of this situation will be appreciated when it is known that Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, when appearing today before the Senate Finance Committee on the pending tax bill, let it be known that the current fiscal year's deficits would hit an all-time peak of \$5,996,000,000 by June 30, and that within 14 months this deficit would mount to \$8,641,000,000.

A statement released for publication today by the American Federation of Labor, an organization thoroughly friendly to the present administration, discloses that last month there were 12,184,000 persons still without normal work in industry. There is no better authority as to unemployment conditions than this organization. If anything were needed to show the utter and complete failure of the policy of borrowing and spending and wasting and squandering our way out of the depression and into prosperity, it is this.

I shall vote no more taxes upon an already overburdened people until such time as sanity in expenditures returns to this Government. Wild, wasteful, unnecessary spending seems to be limited only by the amount of money they can raise by taxation and by borrowing, thus increasing the national debt, which is now at a high peak for all time.

These wasters, these boondogglers, seem to forget that every dollar spent must be earned by someone. They forget that every dollar of tax extracted from the pockets of the toilers and others means one dollar less that can be spent for the necessities of life. They overlook the fact that as taxes increase the standard of living of our people decreases. They have piled upon us debts that cannot be paid in generations, and the end is not yet.

Anticipating, I suppose, their future desire for the money, the administration asked and received at the hands of this complainant Congress the authority to increase the national debt to \$45,000,000,000, and this, my friends, is something for all of us to think about; but more particularly should the youth of the country ponder this and realize what such an eventuality will mean to them and the generations to come after them.

Representative TABER, of New York, ranking Republican member of the Appropriations Committee, in debating the tax bill, pointed out ways in which more than a billion dollars can be saved without crippling any legitimate function of government nor withholding any necessary money for relief. I have suggested others. Courageous, intelligent action along the lines suggested will make unnecessary any tax bill at this time. Why not leave upon the statute books the corporation taxes now yielding an estimated eleven hundred million dollars this year, which this bill surrenders? Why place the corporations of the country in a posi-

tion where they can, if they are satisfied to conduct their business in an improvident way and lay aside no surplus for the proverbial rainy day, pay no tax whatever? That is what this bill will permit. Why abandon certain definite revenue, and the methods whereby it can be secured, and enter upon another tax experiment of exceedingly doubtful productivity?

A careful study of the bill would seem to indicate that three classes of corporations only would not be embarrassed by the enactment of this bill. They are, first, the larger corporations having at this time adequate surplus to carry them through another period of economic distress. Second, public-service corporations dealing in the necessities of life, and because of this fact having a more continuously stable volume of business than the ordinary corporation. Third, the great chain-store corporations, the business of which is of a character to lend itself readily to expansion, and just as readily to contraction by closing any 1 or 100 of its units whenever they show a loss. For this reason it is not necessary for this class of corporations to carry great surpluses to tide them over an extended period of loss.

As a matter of fact, the penalties upon business resulting from this legislation will fall most heavily upon the smaller corporations, that constitute the industrial and business backbone of the Nation, and those larger organizations which, after the past 5 years of business adversity, find themselves at this time without sufficient surplus to carry them through additional years of adversity. The burdens will rest most heavily upon those least able to bear them and most lightly upon those best able to bear them.

There are very serious objections to the bill, other than those I have mentioned, which I have not the time to elaborate upon, but which are summarized in the report to the House by the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, as follows:

1. It will discourage and possibly prevent the accumulation of adequate rainy-day reserves and constitutes a direct threat to the security of business, employment, and investments.
 2. It will cause corporations to restrict the distribution of their existing tax-paid reserves, which can only be rebuilt under penalty.
 3. It will discourage business rehabilitation and expansion and have a retarding effect upon recovery and reemployment.
 4. It will hamper the growth of small corporations, impede the development of new enterprises, and foster monopolies.
 5. It puts a penalty on prudence and a bounty on improvidence and constitutes an unwholesome interference with the exercise of sound judgment in the management of business.
 6. It will accentuate the extremes of future booms and depressions.
 7. It will oppress businesses burdened with debts and will result in a restriction on corporate credit.
 8. It will drive capital out of productive enterprise into tax-exempt securities.
 9. It violates every sound principle of income taxation, is arbitrary and oppressive in its application, and will be unequal and discriminating in its operation.
 10. It will crucify financially weak business enterprises, while permitting the strong to minimize or entirely escape the tax.
 11. It will create inequities and unfair competitive situations which are far greater and more real than the imaginary ones it purports to correct.
 12. It will result in the double taxation of all dividends paid out of reserves, whether accumulated in the past or in the future.
 13. It will cause untold confusion and add bewildering complexities, both in the computation and administration of the tax.
 14. It abandons an assured revenue of \$1,100,000,000 annually for one purely speculative and uncertain, and which promises to be most disappointing in amount, thereby further jeopardizing the Federal revenue.
- I might say, in closing, that during the hearings on this bill in no single instance did the representatives of any large corporation appear in opposition thereto.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Under the special order for today the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I did not withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman had withdrawn the point of order.

Mr. WITHROW. I said that I would withhold it. I insist on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. STACK. I ask the gentleman to withdraw that until I can get through with these remarks, as I have an important engagement. Will the gentleman please withdraw his point of order?

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, would it be possible for me to yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, I should like to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. If the gentleman will propound his question, I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in considering the Frazier-Lemke bill on the 11th of May. I am fearful that the House will recess or adjourn, so that not enough legislative days will intervene so as to permit consideration of the measure on the 11th of May. That was my purpose in making the point of order, so that we would be in session tomorrow, if necessary, in order to supply the required number of legislative days, so that we might consider the Frazier-Lemke bill on May 11.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am very glad that the gentleman propounded that question, and I am very glad to answer it not only for his information but for the benefit of all those who may be interested in the Frazier-Lemke bill.

There have been 218 signatures attached to the petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of that bill. The bill, under the rules of the House, will come up for consideration on the 11th day of May. I want to give the gentleman assurance that, as far as I am concerned, and all of those of us who are in anywise responsible for the program upon this side of the House, there will be no effort whatever, either by attempts to recess or any other parliamentary obstacles, to prevent consideration of that rule on the 11th day of May.

Mr. WITHROW. That is fine. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state also to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he has examined the calendar and finds that even if a recess is taken over tomorrow, Saturday, and the following Saturday, unless other recesses are taken, the motion to discharge will be in order on the 11th of May.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the Chair. That is fine.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. STACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHAT IS A CONGRESSMAN?

Mr. STACK. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues of the House, I come before you today to give you my humble reaction to what happened last Tuesday, April 28, in my district, the Sixth of Pennsylvania, where as you know a primary election was held. It was an interparty affair and the issue was clearly drawn—the people, or representative government versus slate making by the so-called political bosses behind closed doors. On the one side were the honest-to-God voters of the district—the average citizens, the electors who, if you please, actually own the Government and should rule or direct it, following my philosophy of government or in accordance with Jefferson's philosophy of government. Fortunately for me and representative government these were in the majority. On the other side was the so-called political organization, which by some method, mostly hallucination, imagined that it had absorbed the political mantle of Matt Quay, Boise Penrose, Jim McNichol, and Bill Vare, who not so very long ago used to be able to send into the district a slate concocted in sunny Florida or in the balmy air of Ventnor, N. J., consisting of a candidate who sometimes did not even live in the district, like my illustrious predecessor, and we had to like it and vote for him or not vote at all.

During the campaign I did not mention my opponent's name once. Personalities were not involved here, but principles were involved. I did mention, however, his political backers; and I told my people, with evident effect, that if he were nominated and elected to Congress he would have to take orders, not, however, from them, but from his political bosses. I also told them that if I were their choice I would continue to be their servant, glorified if you will, but just the same their servant, to do their reasonable bidding in the Halls of Congress. That I would continue to vote for and work for legislation favorable to the masses as against the special privileged.

Mr. Speaker, those opposing me brought all kinds of pressure to bear on my friends and workers, even threatening to take their little State and Federal jobs away from them, and in some cases actually doing it. But to no avail. Why? Because my people, the good people of my district, knew my record here in the Halls of Congress; they knew that I had supported the New Deal in all its liberal legislation; they knew that I had their interest at heart and not the money changers; they knew that the American Federation of Labor had endorsed me because my vote has been and always will be for labor; they knew that as a veteran who fought and bled for his country that I was and am interested in the veteran and his dependents; they knew that the substitute post-office employees and all Federal employees benefited by my presence here in Congress; they knew that I was and am against the private control of money under the guise of our so-called Federal Reserve System and that I was and am for the restoration to Congress of its constitutional right to coin money and control the value thereof. Incidentally, in my district there are some 90 units of the National Union for Social Justice. Through his radio voice Father Coughlin had educated them. They knew what they wanted and what they want in and from their Congressman. They are a power not only in my district but throughout the State, as some of my colleagues fortunately or otherwise well know. They are not politicians—just plain businessmen and women interested in the business of their Government; and, after all, Government is a business; it is your business and my business. It is the business or ought to be the business of everyone.

My colleagues of the House, as your friend I am asking you to listen attentively to their proposition. These militant crusaders in behalf of representative government are here to stay; they are here to see that you and I, their servants, shall represent them properly and shall take care of their business in a business manner. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and my friends of the House, my humble reaction to Tuesday's primary in Philadelphia is that you and I must and shall be representatives of the many, not of the few. We must try to represent all our people all the time. We must realize that there are movements sweeping the country uncanny in their strength because of the fact that the public as a whole are sick and tired of gag rule and gang rule and the manipulation of national legislation by a handful of "rubber stamp" leaders who take order from the higher-ups.

We must realize, as I certainly do, that our chief concern here in Congress must be the concern that we should be for Mr. Average Citizen. We must be believers in fair play and that no legislation, that no bill which has any merit should be smothered in committee.

If we do this honestly and fairly our constituents back home will know it and appreciate it and reward us by returning us to office.

They renominated me, and they will reelect me by the largest majority a Democrat ever got out of Philadelphia, the quondam home of Toryism and Republicism.

In conclusion, I want to thank all my friends back home for all the support they gave me in this campaign. I want to thank the National Union for Social Justice. I want to thank the advocates of an old-age pension as proposed in the McGroarty bill. I want to thank Mr. Green and all the friends of organized labor. I want to thank the retail druggists of West Philadelphia for their cooperation and promise them that I will do all I can toward helping to enact into law the Robinson-Patman bill. And, finally, I want to thank the veterans of my district and all the good people who so ably supported my candidacy on April 28, 1936. [Applause.]

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STACK. I yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. I congratulate the gentleman upon his wonderful victory. Incidentally, having in mind the gentleman's address of some weeks ago, I should like to inquire, what became of McCloskey?

Mr. STACK. I would rather let the dead stay buried.

Mr. BOYLAN. There is another boy the gentleman spoke about, Turk Connally. What happened to him?

[Here the gavel fell.]

OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object to the request of the gentleman from Indiana, I hope no one else will make a similar request, because we are exceedingly anxious to proceed with the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. I am in accord with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, there was a time in our early history when men were more equal to labor to live under our free competitive system of industry than they are today.

There was a time when men could claim the right of more equal opportunity, the right of more equal advantages to labor under our free competitive system of industry than they can claim and hold today.

There was a time when men could labor and take more equal earnings and income, could accumulate more equal property and wealth, and could acquire more equal means with which to live under our free competitive system of industry than they can take and acquire today.

There was a time when the average common man could earn enough and save enough, and did earn and save enough, not only to provide for himself as he labored but to maintain himself and family in old age.

There was a time when parents, meeting with misfortune, a son or child or children, while providing for themselves and families, could help the old folks at home.

And there was a time when the head of the family alone could provide for his wife and children and meet all their requirements to live without his wife, sons, and daughters being compelled to help make the living.

NEW AND CHANGED CONDITIONS

But these times of more equal opportunities and advantages have passed—gone—and been supplanted by the few taking the greater share of the income and amassing swollen fortunes and leaving only the meager portion to be divided up among the many.

Under these new and changed conditions the common laboring man can no longer earn a living while he labors and save up for old age, and a son or child or children, while supporting their own families, can no longer help the old folks at home.

This failure of earnings and income of the masses, the many of the people, has brought a new problem for solution, the problem of providing means of support for the aged and dependent people under which old-age pension legislation has become a vital necessity of the time.

PENSIONS FOR OLD AGE IMPERATIVE

Under these new and changed conditions pension payments for old-age support have become vital and imperative to make up for the want and failure of sufficient earnings and income in the prime working days of men to provide a living while they labor and for old age in their declining days.

Under these new and changed conditions the responsibility for the support of the aged has shifted or is shifting from the people themselves and from the sons and children of parents and has become an obligation upon the State and Nation which the Government must assume as a policy of public justice and human welfare.

OUR INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

Our free competitive system of industry is a natural system of industry which has grown up and developed among the people and under which they could live in plenty and great abundance accordingly as they are willing to toil and labor in recognition of the equal rights of men.

But under the impulse of selfish human nature actuating the shrewd, crafted, and resourceful, a certain, special few men have taken more than they have earned or could enjoy

and have held these earnings from use and comfort of the many, the masses of the people. And the timid, confiding and unsuspecting, yielding to the strenuous strain of human greed of the strong, powerful, and designing, have taken less than they have produced and than they need and require and less than sufficient to provide for the common necessities of life, even while they are laboring from day to day, and nothing when they have reached old age.

ENOUGH FOR ALL

There is enough wealth and property created, enough of the necessities, comforts, and conveniences, if apportioned as created or produced, to supply all of the people of the world in plenty and great abundance. The wealth produced or created by men is about in equal shares and proportions to each man or individual of the population and if held in such substantial equal portion all would be equally and amply provided for, with the comforts of life today.

But wealth produced in substantially equal shares is held in grossly unequal proportions in vast amounts by a certain, special few, and only the smaller part and remainder by the many to be divided and apportioned out among the masses.

A GAMBLING INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM

A just, honest, and fair industrial system is an industrial system under which every man takes accordingly as he labors, accordingly as he toils to produce and share equally, fairly, and justly with his fellow man and coworkers the fruits of his labor and toil.

But we do not have today an honest and fair industrial system under which the men who create the wealth may take a fair and equal portion of the wealth and property they produce and under which they can take and enjoy the fruits of their toil and labor. Instead of such just industrial system, we have a gambling industrial system, we have a jiggerly industrial system, a system under which the certain, crafty few can take and manipulate wealth the many produce, and who can take and are taking and hold more, without performing any service to their fellow man, than the men whose toil and labor produces the wealth.

WAYS LEFT OPEN

Under the forms and safeguards of our industrial system provided and left open to insure and guarantee the economic freedom and industrial liberty of the dependent, individual man to labor to live, the certain, special, crafty few have come in to usurp and take advantage of the timid, confiding, and unsuspecting many.

Through certain gambling operations, through the hidden forms of corporations, creating superpower over individual men, through certain bond and stock manipulations, through certain grain and provision-market operations and other shrewd and crafty forms devised, the certain, crafty, special few have taken advantage of these ways left open to appropriate the wealth created by the many, until the people are left with a bare subsistence while toiling and laboring to live and to suffer want and destitution in their old age and declining days.

Under this gambling industrial system, money is manipulated and used to make more money and to make and accumulate money faster than men can labor to make money by the toil, wear, and sacrifice of their bodies. And capital under covered gambling forms is made to yield more earnings and income than all the toil and labor of men and in a few short years to double and triple itself, absorbing all or a greater portion of the income of industry earned in our competitive industrial system.

MEANS OF ADVANTAGES

Wealth under our gambling industrial system, produced by labor, is taken from the people in many crafty and ingenious ways, under grain and produce-market manipulations, under covered bond and stock maneuvers, under control of prices and supplies, by buying, holding, and selling operations, and by creating scarcity or surplus at will.

PRIVATE CONTROL OF MONEY

But the control of money, the most vital part and element of our industrial system, is probably the greatest power

under which advantage is taken and by which taxes, interest, and debts are doubled and tripled upon the people secretly covered, hidden, and concealed.

Money is that part of the means and facilities of our economic and industrial system whereby to enable the people to exchange their services and what they produce for other services and what others produce in providing for their wants and needs. Without the means and facilities of money our specialized industrial system could not operate or function for a single day. The people could not provide themselves with the necessities and comforts of life. They could not take what others produce, nor provide or furnish others with what they produce.

Money, the lifeblood of industry, has been and still is under the private, selfish control of a few bankers and financiers, the shylocks and money changers of today, with power to make high prices or low prices or a panic at will, accordingly as may best serve their interests for the time. By the secret control of money our industrial system cannot only be manipulated, the production and wealth and property, the earnings and income from industry, cannot only be acquired, controlled, and held, but property, earnings, and income can be taken without the knowledge of the people by whose toil and labor it has been produced.

ALL WEALTH CREATED BY LABOR

All wealth which exists today in necessities, comforts, and other forms has been dug out of the ground or produced by the strenuous toil and labor, by the brawn, muscle, and sweat of the brow, and without which no wealth could exist and none of the necessities, comforts, and conveniences could be used and enjoyed by the people.

Under this perverted industrial system, this gambling industrial system, the men who have dug the wealth out of the ground or who have created or produced it by their toil and the sweat of the brow possess and enjoy the least of it. And the men who have neither dug it out nor labored to create or produce the wealth possess the greater part or share of it and use and enjoy the most of it.

GREAT WEALTH HELD BY A FEW

Today some single, individual men hold and possess property and wealth which has required the labor of thousands working their lifetime to create, and the few are taking the earnings and income sufficient to support these thousands while laboring and during old age.

Today under this gambling industrial system some men have taken and are now holding wealth produced by the toil and labor of others which they themselves could not have dug out of the ground, nor created by their toil and labor working night and day every hour since the days of Christ on earth.

Entering under and through the ways left open in our free, competitive system of industry, concealed under the forms of corporations, through market and gambling operations, the few have taken from the masses, the many, until the greater portion of the people have been impoverished during life and left helpless and dependent in old age.

Under this gambling, perverted industrial system, the certain, special few men are taking and holding wealth, earnings, and income which they can never use or see, which they can never realize or enjoy, all for the abnormal pleasure and gratification of holding from the possession and use of others. Under this gambling industrial system in a hidden, covered, and concealed way one-tenth of the people are taking nine-tenths of the income, and nine-tenths of the people are receiving and trying to live and sustain their physical bodies from one-tenth of the income from industry.

THE ABNORMAL FEW

These certain, special few men are the men in whom selfish human nature has been abnormally accentuated, cultivated, and developed, until the impulse to take and possess property, wealth, and hold from others has become a mania, a ruling passion of their lives.

And the way has been left open in our economic and industrial system, concealed under the forms of business or operations and with the secret and private control of money, whereby to take from the many, the masses, the wealth which

they have produced, their earnings and income from their toil and labor.

THE AUTOMATIC MACHINE

While wealth, the earnings and income of labor, were being filched and taken from the masses under our gambling industrial system, the automatic machine was invented to lighten the labors of men to live and to help them produce more and better of all the necessities and comforts of life. But instead, the machine has been seized upon by the shrewd, crafty, and resourceful to further take from the laboring masses their substance, earnings, and income and finally used to dispense with their employment and to further reduce their earnings and income and leave them even more destitute in old age.

If our free competitive system of industry has been left free and equally safeguarded for all the people to labor to live and enjoy the fruits of their toil, the machine, instead of a curse, to reduce their earnings and income and employment, would have come as a blessing to men to aid them to live better and to enjoy more.

THE MACHINE MUST WORK FOR ALL

If the machine could be made to work for all the people, it would not make a scarcity of employment; it would not take the laboring man's place—if the laboring man could take a just share of the earnings and profits of the machine for his own use and advantage, he could work on full time and live better—he could work on full time and have more than before the machine was invented.

The work of the world is not all done. There is more work yet to be performed than all the machines and men can do, than all the machines running full time can do, than all the men working full time can do. Both could not perform all the work that is needed, could not produce more than all the people could enjoy by working full time every day for the next 50 years.

It is a perverted industrial system that, because a few men cannot make profits, the masses must remain idle and in suffering until they are hungry and dependent, until they are exposed to the weather and the elements and driven to public charity and relief.

There is a new day coming in industry. There is a new day coming for the laboring man. There is a new time approaching, when the machine and the laboring man will produce the necessary comforts and conveniences for use and service of all the people without stopping when profits fall for the few.

CONDITION OF PEOPLE BEFORE PANIC

Even before this panic came in 1920 and 1929 the conditions of the laboring masses was growing more and more precarious. The right of men to labor was becoming more and more uncertain, and with their earnings and income vanishing they were already living in fear and apprehension of the future and approaching old age.

When this panic and depression came first in 1920 and again in 1929 the rich had been and were growing richer and the poor poorer for 50 years, and until a few of the people had come to hold and control the greater share of the created wealth and were taking a like portion of earnings and income.

THE CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

Such was the concentration of wealth in a certain special few. Such was the plight of the many, the masses, from whom wealth had been filched and taken. Such was the meager earnings and income, the failure of the buying and consuming power, of the tax, interest, debt, and mortgage-paying power of the many, the masses, the multitude, when the international bankers and financiers, the modern money changers, in 1920 and 1929, in mad, frenzied, and impatient haste, cornered and withdrew the money supply, brought a fall of values, prices, and wages, prostrating and paralyzing industry, and stopped even the meager earnings coming to the common masses and laboring people.

With the panic coming and continuing throwing the masses out of employment, leaving them in fear, dread, and

apprehension of their condition in the future with no security for labor, they are demanding that they be assured against unemployment and failure of income and that provision be made for them in the dependency of old age.

THE PROBLEM LONG REALIZED

While this problem of old-age support has been only suddenly realized by many people, it has long been apprehended and warned against by economic students of the times. It has been coming gradually for over 50 years, with the concentration of wealth in a few and the failure of earnings and income in the many. The problem was seriously facing our social order as a menacing and threatening economic evil even when the panic and depression came, which only brought existing conditions to a full realization and crisis and uncovered and made apparent what was already, in fact, at hand as a pressing emergency to be met.

CONFUSING TAXES IN THE PRICE OF THE VITAL NECESSARIES

There is no tax plan or system more complex, confusing, and less understood in the minds of the people of the country than sales or transaction taxes, and which can more plausibly be urged not only upon the confiding and unsuspecting people but upon many honest leaders of men.

A sales or transaction tax is a tax so mixed, mingled, and confused, so hidden, covered, and concealed in the increased price of the vital necessities of life, that a galling, burdensome tribute can be levied upon and collected from the people without the knowledge of a tax imposed, and while the people are left groaning from its crushing weight. A sales or transaction tax is not only a tax in gross violation of the principle of the ability to pay and every policy of just taxation, but its most vicious part and effect is the exemption of the rich from their just burdens of the Government.

THE OBLIGATION OF GOVERNMENT

Such is the economical and industrial condition of the country, and such is the plight of the aged dependent under our gambling, perverted industrial system—left starving, freezing, suffering, destitute in the midst of the very wealth and riches which they have worn out their bodies to create. And such is the obligation and responsibility of the Governments, State and National, to provide for the comforts of the aged, whom they have allowed exploited and exhausted of their earnings, income, and substance by a toleration or failure to remedy the evils and abuses under which the masses have been filched and left destitute.

A TAX UPON THE RIGHT TO LIVE

A sales or transaction tax is a tax upon the vital necessities of life required by the common masses to live. It is, in fact, a tax upon the right of the many, the masses, to live and reduces their earnings and income by the amount of the tax imposed. It is for this reason alone that a sales or transaction tax is invariably and always urged upon Congress by those who represent the great fortunes whenever new or additional taxes are proposed, and who seek to protect great wealth and riches from the payment of an equitable share of the tax burden.

TAXING THE POOR

Such a tax to provide for the support of the aged and dependent people would be a tax upon their children and upon the common classes and the poor, and would be in effect to exempt the rich and the holders of swollen fortunes from the payment of just or substantial part of taxes.

HOW WEALTH IS HELD

The wealth created by the toil and labor of the many, the masses, the multitude, and taken by the certain special few under the evils of our industrial system is held under so-called vested titles, through corporation shares, stocks, and bonds to great physical property, wealth, and assets.

This great, accumulated physical wealth into which the people's earnings and income have gone is not susceptible of division or separation for return back to the people for use in kind and portion required for their support in old age.

Any attempt now to share or apportion this great predatory accumulation of wealth would dismantle industry and trade, would throw our industrial system back to primitive

means and methods and make men "jacks of all trades" and leave them masters of none. We must deal with the world as it is, in the form it has been permitted to assume, and not as it ought to have been made and kept to conserve the natural rights of men to labor upon the earth to live and enjoy the fruits of their labor.

INCOME ALONE TO BE REACHED

But these great property interests and wealth are bringing to the certain, special few a great swollen stream of earnings and income which they can never use and enjoy, which they can never see or realize, and which they are hoarding and holding for the abnormal pleasure and gratification of keeping from the use and enjoyment of others. It is only in the form of surplus earnings and income that the wealth taken and appropriated from the toiling, laboring masses can now be reached and taken for a return of a share and portion back to those whose labor produced it for their support in old age.

A TAX UPON THE INCOME OF SURPLUS WEALTH AND SWOLLEN FORTUNES

Before a tax is assessed and levied upon the common masses of the people either in the form of a direct tax, or an indirect sales or transaction tax (which is a tax upon the common masses and the poor) to provide support by a pension for the aged and dependent, a tax should be assessed and levied upon the earnings, dividends, and income from surplus wealth and swollen fortunes sufficient and ample to provide these aged and dependent people with comforts for their remaining years.

SHARING THEIR OWN INCOME

And this should be provided them not as public charity or as a dole but as delayed and deferred payments of a just and equitable share of income from their own created wealth.

THE GOLDEN RULE

Until we can eradicate the economic evils of the times, until we can suppress the industrial gambling operations, until we can overcome monopoly and restraint of trade and make our industrial system free for every man to labor to live and to take and enjoy the fruits of his labor, we must invoke the Golden Rule in favor of the aged and dependent and provide them with a pension for support which will afford the same comforts and necessities which we would wish provided for ourselves, suffering under like conditions and misfortunes.

And bringing the Golden Rule down to date we should be ready and willing to provide an old-age-pension law and system which will assure the aged people with the same substantial comforts we have enjoyed and would wish to enjoy during our remaining days if left without provision in old age.

THE EVILS MUST BE REMEDIED

But the aged and dependent people left helpless and destitute in this crisis must not only be cared for and supported, but economic conditions must be restored so that their children can earn and save enough, while providing as they labor to live, to support themselves in ample comfort in old age and their declining days.

It would be sad tragedy and commentary upon the future and the young people today to encourage them to spend their all as they labor in wanton indifference and waste with full reliance upon the Government for support when they grow old and infirm.

When the child cannot be trained and brought up in his youth, when character is molding and encouraged to be ambitious, frugal, and saving, with pride, satisfaction, and self-reliance, the progress of the human race will be at an end. It is individual responsibility, it is industrial self-reliance, it is individual initiative which makes for and builds up stability of character and prepares men for the contests which they have waged and must wage in the course of the battles of life.

LABOR MUST TAKE A JUST SHARE OF THE MACHINE EARNINGS

The remedies for the evils of the machine claimed taking the place of the laboring man is not to slow down or stop the automatic machine but to keep the machine working more for the laboring man with whom it is competing and for labor to

take the earnings of the machine to maintain buying and consuming power.

While the remedy for those who seek more leisure, with no ambition to live better or enjoy more, may be to reduce their working hours and time, the remedy for those who are ambitious to have more, enjoy more, and live better is for them to work on their full time during their prime working days. The remedy for the working man is to take the earnings and income of the machine under cooperative or collective operations, maintain his normal earnings and income and his full working time and employment during his prime, live better, and enjoy a more abundant life while working and providing support for old age.

If the masses could have only claimed the advantages of the automatic machine in industry, every man who was ready and willing to work, who was willing to toil and labor to live to earn by the sweat of his brow, would have been able to take not only the bare necessities of life but would have been able to use and enjoy a greater share of the necessities and comforts and many of the luxuries as well.

The automatic machine can only produce. It cannot eat, it cannot wear, it cannot take, use, and consume the necessities and comforts which it produces. And the certain, special few men taking the greater share of the earnings and income, which under our system of industry is the buying and consuming power, are alike without capacity to consume what the automatic machine produces.

Unless the toiling masses, the multitude, who alone have the capacity to take and consume production, can take a share of the earnings of the automatic machine, the means to consume what the machine produces, the wheels of the machine will slacken, slow down, and finally stand still and rust away on their bearings.

THE AGED DEPENDENTS

I deny and resent the charge made against these elderly, dependent people that they are deliberately taking advantage of the panic and condition of the times to lay down on the taxpayers and claim their support from the Government.

Even under this perverted industrial system, many of these men, now dependent, looking to old age, had been saving for their declining years. They had put their money in the banks or they had paid into building and loan associations, or they had bought investment stocks from which to draw when their working days were over. And many of these elderly, dependent people had been paying on a humble home with only a few hundred dollars remaining to pay when their home would be free and in which they could live in their frugal way. They had worked their way to humble independence and saved up for the coming rainy day.

WHEN THE PANIC CAME

Such was the condition of these aged dependent people when the panic or depression came. They were still working and proud to work, working at their life's chosen trade, or exchanging for a lighter task, but working on the same as before and striving to live on their insufficient pay.

Still up to the panic of 1929, the many with their savings vanishing, and the machine taking away their employment, the masses were toiling on hopeful and cheerful, straining under loss of property and income to provide the necessities of life burdened and held for excess profits.

Up to the time the panic came the work-worn, aged workingman was still holding some savings earned and laid by during former years, still paying on his mortgage, still hoping to provide for his infirm and declining years.

THE AGED WILLING TO WORK

Even at past 60 many of these elderly people and with a fair saving in hand accustomed to an active life, refused to stop, to step aside and retire, but took just pride and satisfaction in the realization of self-reliance in still working to make their way.

But when the panic came with other men they lost their places. And while waiting for employment to return they were forced to encroach upon their savings, stinting, spend-

ing little day by day, until finally their savings were exhausted and their provision for old age was gone.

Or while waiting for employment to return the bank broke with their money on deposit, or the building and loan closed, unable to pay, or their investment stocks fell and fell until they were worthless papers and their home went to delinquent tax sale, or their mortgage was foreclosed.

THE DOOR OF INDUSTRY CLOSED AGAINST THEM

And then seeking employment they found none and were told that when employment did return their advanced age would bar them. The door of industry had swung and closed against them forever, through which they could never enter again. They must wait on the relief rolls for the final summons to come.

WAITED FOR EMPLOYMENT TO RETURN

And even after the panic came the laboring men and common masses waited for employment, waited in patience and forbearance, waited in Christian fortitude for prosperity to come "around the corner", waited while their meager means were being exhausted, waited while their taxes went delinquent, waited while their home was being foreclosed, waited, suffering and in want, while seeing their life savings fade away. And even then they were undismayed, still buoyant, hoping for employment, waiting for a new opportunity, waiting to start life over again, still anxious and impatient to labor to vindicate their pride and their spirit of self-reliance.

And even when this new administration came in 1933 to bring a return of prosperity, the industrial working or laboring men were still buoyant with hope and courage, still looking for employment to return, still waiting to maintain their pride, to vindicate their will to work, their courage to toil on and labor to live.

These aged, work-worn, laboring men were still ready to try again and regain their lost savings and fortunes, to recover their mortgaged homes, until the door of industry was declared locked and closed against them forever and left in a state of helpless destitution. They were not even then asking for a pension. They were only asking to toil and labor. No pension program was demanded. They were still proud and self-reliant, asking no favors but the right to labor to live.

THE AGED HAD SAVED FOR OLD AGE

These old people now dependent were active and industrious in their prime. They had earned and saved up enough to have provided frugally for their comforts, the necessities for their declining days. And if they could have lived and worked under an honest industrial system, if every man had been allowed to take the wealth, earnings, and income he had produced, they would have spurned and resented a pension as a claim of charity or benevolence.

And if there had been no panic to bring the condition of the people already suffering from a failure of earnings and income under the evils of this gambling system to a crisis, the demand for an old-age pension would have been long delayed and postponed.

Under the delay of two administrations, the suffering and dependency of 6 years, the hope of prosperity long deferred, the realization of a bare existence even with a return of employment, finally destroyed their morale, the pride and independence of men, and many have been driven to relief and to live a precarious existence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a brief editorial on flood control from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it would please me very much to be able to make an exception in the case of my colleague from Pennsylvania, but the gentleman knows it is the established policy not to print editorials in the RECORD. Much as I regret to do it, I am forced to object.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill

(H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval forces for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12527, with Mr. VINSON of Kentucky in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the order of the House on yesterday, there remains 1 hour and 30 minutes of general debate on this bill, to be confined to the bill. Of this hour and a half the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] has at his disposal 1 hour. Is my understanding correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that I am not taking time from some Members who really could add more than I can to the discussion of the Navy appropriation bill; but in a general way, and because of the happenings of the last 2 or 3 days, and because I took the floor on May 2, 1935, for a similar reason, I really desire just a few minutes at this time to express myself along the same line.

It is not surprising that there exists among our people such real concern over these greatly increased expenses for military and so-called defensive purposes. Much real discussion and anxious consideration has been evidenced, especially during the past year, in the great anxiety of our people in general to formulate proper neutrality legislation. Vast expenditures for military purposes do not appeal too strongly as the method which may convince other nations of our peaceful aims. As representatives of the people, it is our plain duty to vote money sufficient for their protection. Under these extraordinary conditions, especially when funds are so much needed to alleviate distress, we are hard put to prove that we are, in the slightest degree, likely to be attacked by any foreign power. It is inconceivable that anything can happen of such provocative nature that would make a declaration of offensive warfare have any appeal to our people. During these days the jingoist would have but scant followers. It is amazing to survey the change of opinion that has taken place in this country. Those Congressmen and Senators who voted against our entering into the World War seem now to be the greatest of heroes and to glory in what was regarded as almost a treasonable attitude at the time.

Now, every one of you know that before you came to Congress this year you were watched very closely with reference to your attitude toward the subject of neutrality and what you would do to try to make foreign nations believe that we had a peaceful attitude toward them. I want it fully understood that I am not debating against the details of this bill. I have great respect for those who formulated the bill, and I shall vote for the bill, of course. It is, perhaps, the best we can do. I am not too familiar with the details, and I would, therefore, be foolish to try to curb it after such study as I have made with relation to it.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have to go home and the other Members of this House have to go back home and convince our people that what we have done is compatible in the matter of making foreign nations feel that we really have peaceful intentions. The gentleman from New York yesterday indulged in a very catching phrase. It is slogans that cause us so much anxiety. He said that "we are burying the forgotten man under the keels of warships." However, it may be wise to make a reasonable expenditure in our Navy if it can be shown that W. P. A. workers could be transferred to such work.

This probably would not be practicable, as but few persons would be fitted for such employment. The burden of the discussion as to the increase of expenditures for military purposes is certainly to be carried on in the comparison of its need to that of relief purposes and its effect in its expres-

sion of our views on neutrality and the interpretation placed by other nations on our really peaceful intentions toward them. Our national recovery is of the paramount importance at the moment. The Nation's leaders in business have gathered in this Capital during the last few days and given full expression of their criticisms of a government which is regarded by a seemingly large majority as being unfriendly and far from helpful to them, even though the country looks to them to bring about this recovery. They are greatly disturbed over the tremendous public debt of mushroom growth. Constantly multiplying taxes and harassment of legislative measures already passed and still threatened cause them utmost concern. We cannot disprove their contention that already they have paid out twenty billions more than necessary to help the unemployment situation. They insist that they have rendered full cooperation, even though it has been done under a constant punitive attitude of an administration unfriendly toward business.

This morning appears the story of the Secretary of the Treasury which he gave in testimony yesterday or the day before before a Senate Finance Committee. Far beyond our early pessimistic statements is the deficit of 1937. We politicians sit here apparently unworried. The larger the appropriation as affecting our individual districts seemingly the more we believe that will help to reelect us. Let businessmen criticize and warn us, but with little effect. We are told that they do not represent the aspirations of the people. They are simply "entrenched greed", in the opinion of this administration. Scant attention is paid to their suggestions here on the floor of Congress. Yet we look to them to pull us out and put the country back on the road to recovery.

Last May I took the floor, urging that the Congress give a little attention to the business leaders who had gathered here from all over the country. I was interested to read what the gentlewoman from Arizona said on yesterday. She complimented so highly the opening courteous address and stated she had read it and reread it. She stated it was a marvelous document, but remarkable for its omissions. I also read that speech, and I read the speech of Mr. Roper, which was also remarkable for its omissions.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD of California. The gentleman has heard of Mr. Carver?

Mr. GIFFORD. I read about him yesterday.

Mr. FORD of California. He is the head of your "brain trust"?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not know about that.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman agree with his philosophy?

Mr. GIFFORD. In answer to the gentleman's question I would say with some of it, "yes"; and some of it, "no."

Mr. FORD of California. What does the gentleman agree with? Does the gentleman agree that young people should not marry until they can own an automobile?

Mr. GIFFORD. We understood yesterday when we read the article and also when I read the article in the forum that you would seize upon that as we seized upon the foolish Tugwellian philosophy.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman agree that is foolish?

Mr. GIFFORD. I do not agree that the Republican Party should gather a "brain trust" to offset the foolishness practiced by your administration.

Mr. FORD of California. Does the gentleman agree with that "brain trust"?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; I do not agree with the idea of a "brain trust." I am opposed to it. I am pleading this morning for sensible businessmen to do the practical work that must be performed by this Congress to bring the Nation back to recovery.

Mr. FORD of California. Then the gentleman disagrees with the Republican "brain trust"?

Mr. GIFFORD. I would do away with all your Tugwellian philosophy. It is not practical. Much of it is silly. I knew

when we employed a "brain trust" that you would immediately dig up all the books that were ever written by them and show their former views, their former so-called puppy views, just like we called the Tugwell views puppy views of his earlier writings.

I read Mrs. GREENWAY's statement about the remarkable absence of certain things in the Sibley speech. She said they did not talk about unemployment except for one brief reference. I think she should be very grateful they did not discuss the way money has been spent in Arizona and New Mexico on unemployment problems.

Then there were the remarkable omissions of Mr. Roper when he issued his various commandments as to what business must do, but not a word to the effect that the Government is now going to desist from its persecution of them. Representing our great Government, Mr. Roper, from whom we really did expect helpful things, said not a reassuring word to the businessmen there assembled. The first day of the conference pleasant and peaceful expressions were passed from one to the other in an attempt to dodge anything of a nature that might be critical of the Government. Finally, on yesterday, the real feeling of these men toward us was given expression, and do our ears not burn when we read it? Shall we continue our attempt to fasten this burden of debt and taxation upon business?

Will you not read their statements about the new tax bill and believe they know its effect upon business? If these businessmen do not understand their own business, certainly we do not. When they tell us they spent \$20,000,000,000 to relieve unemployment, employing more than they needed to produce in the last 2 or 3 years we cannot deny it. We must believe their statement.

I think I see more clearly than I did a year ago when these prominent men of business came to Washington. I find that there is still a great fear all over the Nation in the country districts. Industry will manufacture shoes for us, they will manufacture textiles for us as we need them, but the trouble is that about every individual in every hamlet in the United States who has a dollar is fearful of using it lest it will not return to him. Frankly, we usually live off of each other by interchange of work or produce. In the past we have traded one with the other, but today there is a great fear lest, if I employ you, you will not employ me back, or if you get hold of any money I have, it will find its way to the bank to be frozen. This former interchange is now sadly among the rank and file of the American people.

Business pleads with us to lessen the burdens of taxpayers. Can we not give some assurance that these vast expenditures are going to be curtailed? Can you not openly say that you are really worried about the great public debt and will take steps to diminish it? Can you not say, "Yes; I am greatly concerned, and I do not wonder that Mr. Morgenthau is concerned"? Rather, however, we appear not to worry about it, but continue even greater spending. The President himself, in his cocksureness, reminds me of the man who said, "If I ever had a chance to acknowledge a mistake, of course, I would do so." It becomes painfully evident that he will never acknowledge a mistake.

I regret that the captains of industry should feel forced to come to Washington and to criticize Congress so severely. But can we refute their declaration, "We understand our business; we do not understand politics, but we must fight these politicians who vote away billions and impose impossible taxes"? I am willing to listen to them. I am sympathetic toward them, because they are the only ones that will bring about recovery in this country. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to read a short letter and comment thereon, although I believe the debate is to be confined to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I want to read this letter to expose a racket. It is being circulated apparently quite widely throughout the country. It comes from the office of C. D. Hudson, 308 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.:

GENTLEMEN: You are no doubt acquainted with the fact that the Treasury Department has placed on file with the House Ways and Means Committee a list of all persons who in 1934 were reported as receiving salaries of \$15,000 per year or more. These names and amounts received have become public information, although with only one copy of file it has been impossible to date for any person or agency to copy off the entire list.

We have made arrangements to secure a copy of this list and are in position to furnish at once names reported from at least 20 States. Additional States will be available within a few days, and it is our hope to have the entire list in 10 days to 2 weeks. It is estimated there are approximately 15,000 names on the entire list.

In most instances the following information is provided: Name, city and State, firm affiliation, and salary collected. The names are classified by States.

We are offering these lists to a selected group of high-type clients for the use of their sales departments. We will be pleased to provide you with this information as rapidly as available for a consideration of \$50, for which we would bill you after your receipt of the lists.

In view of the timeliness of this information we would appreciate your prompt consideration of this proposal.

Very truly yours,

C. D. HUDSON.

The House last year had the good sense to defeat the snoopers by repealing the so-called "pink slip" provision. There are bills before the Ways and Means Committee, and especially one introduced by Mr. TREADWAY, to make the salary lists confidential as far as the general public is concerned and simply making lists available for the Members of the House and Senate and the Government departments.

This letter bears out the statement I made on the floor of the House last year that if you make these lists available to the general public they will be more useful to snoopers and racketeers than anyone else, and I am glad that this letter has come to my attention, because it proves the case I tried to make out last year. Although this letter offered the list to a respectable manufacturer, it could easily have been addressed to racketeers and gangsters. I realize that the blame for this unfortunate situation does not lie with the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take this opportunity to thank the Committee on Appropriations for the item included in this bill for the preparation of the site, preliminary test pits, cofferdam, and other preliminary work toward the construction of a graving drydock at Mare Island Navy Yard, which was authorized by the naval public works bill of 1935.

Naturally, I regret that the full amount of the authorization is not to be appropriated at the present time. I asked for that at the hearings, but I realize the problems confronting the committee, which has prevented allocation of this full amount. Possibly the amount now allotted, \$150,000, is all that can reasonably be expended toward construction during the coming fiscal year. It will at least prepare the way and get the preliminary work of clearing the site completed.

The necessity for additional docks on the Pacific coast, both at Mare Island Navy Yard and Bremerton, and possibly elsewhere, was made very clear during the hearings on the naval public works bill last year. Both navy yards are now operating to capacity, and the lack of additional docking facilities requires a considerable amount of overtime work because of the necessarily shortened docking periods. When the naval public works bill was under consideration I presented a brief table showing the dockings at Mare Island and Puget Sound for the fiscal years 1931 to and inclusive

of 1934. I now desire to insert a similar table, bringing it down to the last available date of March 1936:

Dockings at Mare Island and Puget Sound Navy Yards (fiscal years)

Location	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	July 1935-March 1936
Mare Island drydock no. 1.....	25	23	37	27	49	27
Puget Sound drydock no. 1.....	17	40	32	25	37	8
Mare Island drydock no. 2.....	86	89	90	91	82	54
Puget Sound drydock no. 2.....	40	12	18	20	17	10

These data show conclusively that existing docks at Mare Island are being used to the utmost capacity, and, used as they are, ships cannot remain over a limited time in dock, nor for the time that the navy yard believes requisite for proper overhaul. In order to properly maintain satisfactory conditions for naval vessels, it is essential that eventually additional drydocks be provided on the Pacific coast. It will, therefore, be a real saving to the Government in its maintenance cost of naval vessels when the additional docks already authorized are completed.

I am fully aware of the many difficulties that the Appropriations Committee has encountered in endeavoring to allocate funds to those projects which are of most importance to the operation of the Navy. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am very grateful to them for the consideration they have shown in appropriating money for the start of this particular drydock, and I know that as soon as the opportunity is open the additional money for its completion will be made available. [Applause.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, in the morning press we are advised as to the appearance of the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, before the United States Chamber of Commerce yesterday. The burden of his song was that unless we continued our policy of negotiating trade treaties we might have to protect ourselves from the dogs of war which he suggested might be unleashed by all Europe. The trade advantage theme is now to be set aside and an argument highly altruistic in character is offered in its place. If I remember correctly, there was another famous Democrat who was to keep us out of war. Secretary Hull's plan will prove equally disappointing.

Regarding the Canadian treaty, I quote from the Denver Post:

Our kind of liberalism is the big-hearted, open-handed, giving kind. Canadian liberalism is slightly different. It was learned at the knee of Old Mother England, the best go-getter in the world. Secretary of State Hull, our premier diplomat, is an expert at making this sort of trade agreement. He gave away the profits and the security of the beet-sugar business to Cuba, and now he's going to give the western livestock business to Canada. He apparently is trying to make more treaties than William J. Bryan. The commoner's arbitration treaties were at least harmless; Secretary Hull's are not. Leave him in the State Department long enough and there will be no effective tariff on anything. If you inquire of him about the effect on American workers and their families, he will reply, with his sad and humble look, that such matters are not in his jurisdiction, and will most courteously send an aid to show you the nearest relief station, where you will be given your share of the more abundant life free of charge.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to take a few minutes of this body's time to call your attention to one of the follies of this administration. Much has been said in speeches, over the radio, and through the press about the so-called Reciprocal Tariff Act which was approved on June 12, 1934. It is also important that the country should know something of the effect of this New Deal policy and the attitude of this administration toward the industries of this country and those who seek a judicial review of this law.

The hearings before the Ways and Means Committee when this bill was under consideration and the debates on the floor

of the Senate clearly forecast everything that has happened in the administration of this law since its enactment, and, in my opinion, strengthens the prediction as to its unconstitutionality.

When this bill passed the House there was no provision in it for a hearing of any kind, but when it reached the Senate, as a sop to those industries who led an organized opposition to the bill and to those Senators who opposed it, the bill was amended and the present section 4 was inserted. This section reads as follows:

SEC. 4. Before any foreign trade agreement is concluded with any foreign government or instrumentality thereof under the provisions of this act reasonable public notice of the intention to negotiate an agreement with such government or instrumentality shall be given in order that any interested person may have an opportunity to present his views to the President, or to such agency as the President may designate, under such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe; and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

As was predicted at that time on the floor of the Senate, the hearings which have been held prior to the negotiation of the 10 treaties that have been negotiated under this act have been before a committee who has nothing to do with the negotiation of the treaty, but merely acts as a safety valve to permit any representative of industry to register disapproval. In other words, the administration through the newspapers and Government publications announces that it is about to negotiate a treaty with a given foreign country, and without knowing whether or not the commodity which you manufacture is going to be affected or even considered you are given this one opportunity to come down to Washington and offer your objections. After that it is a star-chamber proceeding. The Government economists collaborate behind closed doors with New Deal politicians, and if this group by whim or fancy decide to cut out half the protection which any industry in the United States enjoys under the present tariff act it is done without a word of warning to that industry. The industry first learns in the newspapers of the publication of the treaty which may tomorrow force it into bankruptcy by the invasion of cheap-labor imported merchandise.

As I stated at the outset, we have heard and read much of the efficacy of the New Deal reciprocal-tariff policy. We were told, and we are still being told, that it will increase foreign trade and bring back prosperity. Of course, it has always been difficult for me to understand how you can restore prosperity in this country by opening the doors to competitive merchandise, thereby swelling the army of unemployed, based upon the hope that some foreign country may act as our benefactor by buying American-made high-priced merchandise above the world market. That it has not done so will be seen by some of the facts I am about to state.

Last year importations into the United States increased by \$392,000,000 over 1934. Our exports increased by only \$149,000,000. The bulk of this increase is not due to the New Deal reciprocal-tariff policy. As a matter of fact, up to the end of 1935, only four agreements had come into effect. These were the agreements with Cuba, Belgium, Haiti, and Sweden. The bulk of our increased imports last year came from countries with which we had no agreement. There was, for example, an increase of \$55,000,000 in our imports from Canada, an increase of \$36,000,000 in our imports from Argentina, a \$40,000,000 increase from Great Britain, \$6,000,000 increase from Mexico, \$5,000,000 increase from Soviet Russia, and a \$34,000,000 increase in our imports from Japan during 1935.

The only thing the New Deal reciprocal-tariff policy has succeeded in doing is to disrupt several lines of trade in which they have in their wisdom seen fit to reduce the duty. It is not even possible for the New Deal advocates to claim any credit for the comparatively slight increase in exports. The principal gains in exports last year were to countries

with which we did not have any trade agreement, the United Kingdom and Canada between them accounting for 50 percent of the increase in exports of the United States in 1935.

They told us that this reciprocal-tariff policy was going to be the salvation of the farmer. Last year our exports increased by 7 percent, but the exports of the two groups which make up farm products did not share in this movement. Exports of crude foodstuffs decreased slightly, and exports of manufactured foodstuffs decreased 6 percent. It is time we stopped swallowing the nonsense that has been disseminated as to the advantages of this reciprocal-tariff policy.

On December 7, 1935, at the request of Mr. George S. Fletcher, of Miami, Fla., a fruit and vegetable grower, Lamb & Lerch, a firm of attorneys in New York City, filed a suit in the United States Customs Court at New York attempting to test the constitutionality of this Reciprocal Tariff Act. On January 20, 1936, papers filed by these attorneys in accordance with the regular practice in such matters were forwarded to the United States Customs Court, and in due course set before the third division of that court on March 18, 1936. What took place at that hearing is reported in the New York Times of the following morning, as follows:

TRADE PACT TEST DELAYED BY UNITED STATES—CUSTOMS COURT PUTS CASE OVER AT REQUEST OF ATTORNEYS FOR GOVERNMENT—CUBAN IMPORTS AT STAKE—FLORIDA FRUIT GROWERS CONTEND RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Balked in an attempt to obtain an immediate trial of their test case before the United States Customs Court, attorneys for domestic interests abandoned hope yesterday of getting a United States Supreme Court ruling on the constitutionality of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act before the end of this year.

The third division of the Customs Court, Judge Cline presiding, acting on a motion by Government attorneys fighting the test case by which George S. Fletcher, head of the Florida Agricultural Association, seeks to upset the reciprocal-trade program on constitutional grounds, yesterday adjourned the trial until the June term over protests of John G. Lerch, attorney for Fletcher.

The suit revolves about the duty assessed by the Government on a sample shipment of pineapples from Cuba. In accordance with terms of the trade agreement signed with Cuba in 1934, a tariff rate of 20 cents, instead of the former levy of 40 cents, a case was assessed on the fruit. Fletcher, who imported the shipments, protested the reduced rate and challenged the entire Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act on the ground that Congress exceeded its authority in delegating treaty-making and other powers to the President.

Before a courtroom crowded with spectators representing protectionists, importers, exporters, and others interested in the outcome of the litigation, Mr. Lerch and Charles J. Milville, special attorney on the staff of Joseph R. Jackson, Assistant United States Attorney General in charge of customs cases, engaged in a spirited interchange.

Mr. Lerch charged the Government with following tactics similar to those by which the New Deal successfully delayed tests of the constitutionality of the N. I. R. A., A. A. A., and other measures.

Retorting that the agricultural group involved in the case was attempting to rush the Government into a trial, Mr. Milville held that under long-established custom of the court either party to the suit was entitled to a continuance the first time a case was called for trial.

James Bevans, attorney for the National Council of Importers & Traders, Inc., was given permission to file briefs in the case. His request to participate in the actual trial of the action was denied, however.

Mr. Fletcher, who came here from Miami yesterday expecting to appear as a witness in the trial, told newspaper men outside the courtroom that the jobs of 200,000 Florida residents engaged in fruit packing depend upon the reciprocal-tariff policy being upset.

When Mr. Hull, the present Secretary of State, appeared before the Ways and Means Committee my colleague, Mr. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts, at some length interrogated him as to his views on the constitutionality of this law. Although he was asked the direct question a number of times, a careful examination shows that he neither affirmed nor denied its constitutionality. There have been a number of legal opinions rendered on the constitutionality of this act since it was passed, one of which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1936, page 1645, entitled "Legal Aspects of Trade Agreements", but all of which agree that this law is unconstitutional.

It would seem to me that regardless of a campaign year, if the true purpose of the New Deal were to restore prosperity and to build up a legitimate foreign trade, the sooner the United States Supreme Court had an opportunity to pass upon the constitutionality of this act the better it would be

for this administration to assure the industries of this country of the legality of a policy which the administration has assumed for the benefit of the farmer and industry. But obviously, through its attitude of delay in the United States Customs Court, which is the only tribunal competent to review this act, the Government is afraid to permit that court to pass upon this case until after election. On March 18, although Mr. Fletcher submitted his case without testimony, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of customs asked for a 3-month adjournment in order that he might look for testimony to round out the case of the other side. It is rather novel, to say the least, to find the defendant in a suit asking for an adjournment to supply deficiencies which he alleges to exist in the plaintiff's case. If these deficiencies actually exist, the defendant should rest his case and receive the judgment of the court. Obviously, the reasons given are not the real reasons, and it is difficult to believe that they would have been asserted or the delay granted had there been no national election in 1936. [Applause.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the noise in the Chamber I may have to content myself with talking to the two distinguished ladies on the Republican side this afternoon. I am sure we have a common interest in the appropriations for the national defense.

The introspective quality of mind is a great thing when you come to consider a bill such as a naval appropriation bill. It gives one an opportunity to put himself in a corner and take a sort of moral, mental, and spiritual inventory and disabuse himself of a lot of mental turmoil that always comes along with a bill of this kind. I wish there were about an hour available, because I should like to go into the kind of conflicting emotions that always assail me when I consider a bill of this kind. First, there is the experience of the World War, that has somehow developed a repugnance to the philosophy of submitting international disputes to the arbitrament of the sword. Second, there is the judgment of history that is going to be recorded on us who are shaping the policy of the Nation at the present time. I should like to have history record, so far as I am personally concerned, that at least I sought to make some contribution to the advancement of civilization instead of putting fuel upon the fire of armaments and armament races. Then there comes the queer feeling of expending millions on armament when millions of our people are jobless and hungry. I say the introspective quality of mind is a great thing, because it does give one a chance to come to some settled conclusion and to reconcile what seem to be conflicting emotions.

As we go back home, on patriotic days, we shall no doubt address patriotic assemblages and make stirring appeals for peace. On other occasions we will address the Legionnaires or groups identified with Navy traditions.

I wonder whether the membership of the House has the same difficulty that I have when I address these diverse gatherings. I go home and reflect and study and wonder whether I can reconcile the views I addressed to one body as against the other. Is there a harmony that one can establish in his mind, insofar as peace is concerned, as distinguished from huge appropriations for naval and military armaments? I rather fancy there is; and so I have spent some little time in trying to come to some common ground.

So far as many of the provisions of the bill are concerned, they are, we may say, noncontroversial. Reasonable appropriations for the Hydrographic Bureau and the Bureau of Navigation, for food, fuel, and clothing, for ordnance and technical service, for naval aviation, and all that sort of thing, are not affected by controversy. We can generally agree on those.

I believe we can also find many other points of agreement to which every Member of this House will subscribe. Universal peace is the golden objective which we all seek to attain. We are, or should be, agreed on the principle of

armament reduction as a burdensome thing to the taxpayers of all nations. We can all agree upon the desire to abolish war as a method of settling international controversies. We can agree pretty well that we all experience an uncertain feeling about a budget that daily grows to a greater degree of unbalance. We all agree upon the necessity for adequate defense.

Our problem comes, however, when we seek, each for himself, to determine what constitutes adequate defense and what increases should be approved, if any.

Having listened to a number of gentlemen yesterday afternoon who addressed themselves to the bill, it appears to me that the real controversy centers around an increase in the personnel of the Navy, an increase in new capital ships, and replacement of ships that are presently over age.

So we are trying to determine whether we are to vote for an appropriation in excess of half a billion dollars, increasing the personnel, taking care of replacements under the treaty, and taking care of new ships that will bring us up to the treaty strength. As I evaluate the arguments yesterday afternoon, some said there is no need for expanding the Navy, because nobody will invade this country, nobody can invade this country, that we still enjoy a kind of splendid isolation, and we are not committed to any aggressive military or naval policy, and therefore we do not need such an elaborate and far-flung Naval Establishment.

It is contended that armament reduction is necessary to balance the Budget. It is said that a large Naval Establishment is an incentive to war. It is said that the money required to maintain a large Navy can be better used for humanitarian and educational purposes. It is said further that the naval building race will rush the world into universal bankruptcy, that expenditures in the United States for defense purposes are comparatively larger than in other nations, and finally it is argued that we should assume a position of moral leadership in persuading the other nations of the world to join with us toward ultimate disarmament. Those are the principal reasons for opposition to huge naval expenditures. Some of them are rather persuasive. For others, there is an adequate and convincing answer.

As I look on the other side of the picture, however, to find some reason why I as one who has constantly cherished the hope for universal peace, should support the present bill in most of its particulars, I find first of all that on February 6, 1922, when in connection with the Washington Conference, we assumed a kind of moral leadership in the world in the hope of pointing the major nations in the direction toward disarmament and had actually gone so far that we scrapped seven superdreadnaughts and four cruisers uncompleted in which we had invested \$176,000,000, we found that Japan, France, Great Britain, and all the rest would not follow our leadership. Perhaps at this particular time, when the world is in a state of hysteria and chaos, we cannot afford to sacrifice our Naval Establishment.

It was a glorious opportunity for this Nation and we embraced it. The tragedy of it is that we found no cooperation and support from other nations. There was a momentary appearance of cooperation, but it soon vanished in thin air. That venture cost us \$176,000,000. It was worth it. It would be worth much more than that to have succeeded. At the time of that Washington conference there was tension in the Pacific and elsewhere, and if nothing else was accomplished, we at least relieved the tension for a number of years and made a start on the 5-5-3 limitation between Britain and the United States and Japan.

However, we learned more than that. We learned to our own sorrow that the world had not yet reached the place where we could secure international cooperation toward disarmament except for the customary lip service. We learned also that our faith was a bit premature, and hence there stands before us the lesson of keeping our own naval strength up to the limits established in the treaty.

But on the basis of the present showing and the disturbance and turmoil that you observe in Germany, Italy, France, and other corners of the world, I doubt very much whether it

would be the part of wisdom and discretion for us to sacrifice our naval armaments, or even to let them fall into a state of disrepair, or fall behind the parity ratios that were tentatively established in 1922.

Now, as to armament costs as compared with other nations, I look at these comparative figures as to the per-capita expenditure for naval appropriations in this country as compared with others, and then it occurs to me that they can get five men to work in Japan for the same amount of money that they can get one man on this side. Material costs less over there. Labor is infinitely less. So when we seek by comparison to determine whether we are so far ahead in the naval race we must take into consideration how much more they get for a dollar than we. That throws the figures out of all proportion, and they cannot be used as a yardstick or a guide in coming to a conclusion. I fancy that if we made these comparisons by making proper allowance for the difference in living standards, wage levels, and material costs as between the United States and other nations, their per-capita defense and armament costs would far exceed those of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. McLEOD. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is distressing to think that there is not an hour to discuss this, but I appreciate there is not, and I am thankful for the time the gentleman has given me. I do believe that we cannot afford to let our Naval Establishment be impaired. When we talk about armaments and think of balancing the Budget and reducing expenditures, we are not getting at the real root of the controversy. As I see it, we are going to make some progress in reducing armament to the irreducible minimum after we have eliminated the causes of war. A large navy is not a cause for war any more than a police force is a cause of crime. A large and adequate defense establishment is not an incentive for war. The causes and incentives, as a study of history discloses, lie in the minds and hearts of those who determine the political and economic policies of nations. The causes are international hatred, suspicion, jealousies, commercial rivalries, and all those things that make nations resort to war as a form of political action, because that is all that war is. When those can be eliminated, then perhaps we can make some real progress in the direction of cutting down these huge armaments everywhere in the world.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is not our Navy really our ocean police force in behalf of peace?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is our floating frontier, I would say.

I nurture an abiding hope for the day when there will be no war and when the burden of armament can be materially reduced. But that will come only when the reason for armaments has been eliminated and the most intelligent and constructive contribution that we as Members of Congress can make to that end is to assist in developing in this Nation and in all nations a militant consciousness for peace, for understanding, and an appreciation that war is such a futile and costly way of expressing our differences.

We must get upon solid and logical ground and not confuse the issue by assuming that the physical existence of armies and navies are the moving cause for conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire these 5 minutes in order to ask some of the members of the committee some questions. The first is, looking through this bill I do not find where any provision has been made for what I would term oil-tank supply ships of sufficient capacity and speed to properly serve the large battleships when they are in action or when they are cruising, say, from the west coast of the United States to the Philippine Islands as an illustration. I may say I am not a member of the committee, and

I do not know anything about the building or operation of navies, but I speak as a private citizen who feels that if we are to be a world power, if we are to have a world trade, and if we are to be recognized as one of the major countries of the world, we must have a navy. As a private citizen, I do not believe that the Navy is any good unless we have a merchant marine that will back it up and serve it. I do not think it is any good unless we have auxiliary ships which can supply the Navy when engaged in offensive or defensive warfare.

I should like to ask some member of the committee what there is in this bill which provides in any way whatsoever for oil tankers, for instance, that can supply these capital ships, which can move as fast through the water as the capital ships are supposed to move in the event that we are actively engaged in warfare.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Does the gentleman have reference to the two capital ships authorized under this act?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No. I have made a careful study of the four-power pact and the nine-power pact, and I have done some research work in connection with the recent agreement between Great Britain, France, and the United States, and I think I understand quite clearly what you mean by the two capital ships provided for in this bill, but I have not been able to find any equipment which a layman who is interested could lead himself to believe is capable of supplying our capital ships in times of offensive warfare.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. As I understand, what is troubling the gentleman is that there is nothing in the bill dealing with auxiliary ships?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of the type I am speaking of; yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What particular type is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am referring to this type: In the committee report it is pointed out that we will need something like seven or eight million barrels of oil. Now, suppose we have trouble on the Asiatic front—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I understand what the gentleman is referring to. I will state to the gentleman there is a bill on the calendar now, having been reported by the Naval Appropriations Committee, authorizing additional oil tankers and what are known as additional auxiliary craft. It is pending now. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We must have auxiliary ships to support the fighting ships. There are approximately 150 different types of ships which constitute the auxiliary fleet.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman what provisions, if any, have been made in this bill or any other bill with reference to transport ships?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mrs. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mrs. KAHN. That has always been the weakness of our Navy. Even at the time when President Roosevelt ordered the first round-the-world trip of our American Navy, the colliers and auxiliary ships were ships which were traveling under foreign flags.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Exactly. We have not had during the past 30 years auxiliary equipment for our Navy that was at all adequate, insofar as I am able to find anywhere in the record. The fact that this House only last year passed a Merchant Marine Act and the Senate is now engulfed in a state of chaos in consideration of a Merchant Marine Act is conclusive evidence the auxiliary equipment is not now available. Capital ships are obsolete after 20 to 26 years of service. If new ones are to be built, certainly we must provide new and modern and swift auxiliary equipment to go along with them. Furthermore, a Navy is helpless without an adequate merchant marine, and any informed person knows

we are so far behind in this respect that it is a national tragedy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is clearly misinformed. We have ample ships of auxiliary types to support every type of battleship, submarine, cruiser, and destroyer that the Navy requires.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has 29 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Michigan 24 minutes.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express the profound regret of the minority members of the Navy subcommittee that the chairman is unable to attend the debate on the pending Navy supply bill.

Representative CARY has won our friendship and warm admiration by the impartial spirit of cooperation that has characterized his work as chairman of the Navy subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. In acknowledging his conscientious and whole-hearted efforts in drafting the pending bill, I am happy to pay tribute to those high qualities and the ability which make working with him on the Appropriations Committee a pleasure. I know that all my colleagues in the House join with me in extending the heartiest good wishes for his speedy and complete recovery.

At this time I should also like to speak a word in commendation of Mr. John Pugh, the able and efficient clerk of the Navy subcommittee. Mr. Pugh's long experience and deep knowledge concerning naval affairs have made him an invaluable asset to our subcommittee and his painstaking and untiring efforts have been of great assistance in the preparation of this bill.

In preparing the estimates for the naval supply bill for the fiscal year 1937, a number of reductions were made in the name of economy. There are still a number of items that could be drastically reduced without sacrificing measures essential for adequate national defense. At the same time there are one or two instances where reductions have been made to an extent that justifies the charge of false economy.

Starting with the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1935, funds in the amount of \$10,000,000 were appropriated to build a huge floating drydock. The contract for construction of this dock has not yet been let and the Navy Department is still working on the plans for its construction.

Facts developed during the hearings (pp. 7-10) show that it is really contemplated only to use this floating drydock at Honolulu. No good reason has been given for its construction that would outweigh the additional heavy initial cost and higher expenses of maintenance and operation.

It was testified by Navy witnesses that the cost of constructing a fixed graving dock of the same capacity at Pearl Harbor would be about \$4,000,000, including pumping plant and other accessories. In addition it was shown that the material upkeep would undoubtedly be greater for a floating drydock because its steel construction would be more perishable than concrete when exposed to salt water and weather.

As the Navy Department expects to keep this floating dock permanently located at Honolulu there is no good reason why such a vessel should be constructed thousands of miles from its point of use, and then, at great expense, towed to its probable permanent anchoring place.

This is a frill which has not been justified and which should be eliminated for the sake of sensible economy. When the bill is read for amendment, following the debate,

it is my intention to offer an amendment to provide that a fixed graving dock be used in place of this huge floating experiment and reappropriate the ten millions.

This is an instance where funds could be further reduced without the least danger to proper provisions for adequate defense. I should now like to call the attention of the House to an instance of false economy that has crept into the naval policies of the administration.

On page 416 of the hearings we find that the subcommittee was informed last year by an expert naval witness that slashing needed funds to provide machine tools was "false economy."

This year the estimates for machine tools for use in the naval building program were again reduced. For efficient tools, naval experts had estimated that \$1,400,000 was necessary in addition to the amount finally requested. On page 412 of the hearings appears the question:

Originally, Admiral, you felt that for the efficiency of your Bureau the amount for machine tools, \$2,150,000, was necessary for the efficiency of that work for the coming year, and that that much money was needed to be included in the annual supply bill? Admiral LAND. That is correct.

This same witness had previously testified—page 410—in answering a question relative to possible obstruction of the Navy program resulting from slashing funds for needed machine tools that—

It will be a little more expensive and a little less efficient with a little more delay.

On page 481 of the hearings, and the next few succeeding pages, we find a glaring example of funds being spent without justification. The Government is now operating a factory and producing airplanes and airplane engines at costs far in excess of those incurred by private manufacturers. The testimony in these pages shows that this project, started with an idea of providing a yardstick to measure costs of planes, will be an expensive white elephant. An expert naval witness estimated that it would cost the Navy \$27,000 to build a plane that could be manufactured by a private aircraft concern for \$25,000. In reply to a question, Admiral King told the subcommittee that he could not see any saving in this venture "in the immediate future."

There is another item of considerable importance that the House should bear in mind in passing on naval supply bills. These appropriation measures have not been reflecting the actual expenditures for naval construction. On page 342 of the hearings it was developed that nearly half of the 106 new ships under construction are being built with "emergency" funds.

When the Navy is finally completed to treaty strength the maintenance cost of approximately \$555,000,000 yearly is apt to come as a rather surprising shock to the country. If the Navy is to be built up to treaty strength it should be done openly, rather than by prolonging the process and permitting deficiencies in the matter of needed materials, needed tools, and needed ships. Instead of drawing on emergency funds to help build up the Navy, funds that the country knows nothing about, specific funds should be appropriated in the annual supply bills. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I join with the other Members, both of the majority and the minority, in expressing my regret that the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY] because of illness cannot be here today to carry out the program of this naval appropriation bill.

I feel a word of commendation should be expressed to our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] for his willingness to assume the task of carrying this naval appropriation bill through the House.

Speaking for the minority, in most instances we assure you our whole-hearted support so that this bill may be carried out as the committee has reported it. In most instances we are in agreement. There are some criticisms I feel we of the minority should direct to the attention of the Com-

mittee. The minority since 1933 has taken exception to the general policy of the present administration with respect to the right of the Congress to delegate to the Executive the spending of money. Those who have pacific tendencies, those who feel that the Navy is too large, should be mindful of the fact that in a very large measure this present bill is carrying out a policy of the Democratic administration. I want all the pacifists on the Democratic side of the House to take the blame upon themselves with respect to a large part of the costs of this present Navy bill. You delegated to the President the expenditure of funds. Yours is the responsibility for the course you pursued in connection with those expenditures. The Democrats are responsible entirely if you authorize the Executive to obligate the country and then require this present Appropriations Committee to complete projects for which sufficient emergency funds were not provided. I want every pacifist on the Democratic side of the House to go back into his own district and tell the folks back home that he is responsible for this big Navy bill.

I want the pacifists on the Democratic side to say to their people who complain about the expenditure of all these funds: "We gave the President the right to make these large contracts, to start these stupendous projects, to create these liabilities. He entered into the contracts and they are costing more than they should, but we have to pay the bill."

Just go through the bill and see a few of the items. Just go through the bill item by item and note the extent to which the emergency program provided for through the delegation of power to the Executive by the Democratic side of the House affects the bill, and see whether or not a large part of this Navy bill could not have been eliminated had there been the careful scrutiny, the painstaking investigation, the examination of witnesses which should always precede the matter of the making of appropriations by this body. But you Democrats did not do it. You gave carte blanche authority not for a thousand, not for a million, but for billions.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am sorry I cannot yield. I should like to be courteous, but I have only 17 minutes.

You gave carte blanche authority to the Executive to spend the money and now you are beginning to complain because you have to help finish the projects.

Last year—I am talking to the pacifists—

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am awfully sorry. I will yield if the gentleman can secure me additional time.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute that he may yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina, and yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. O'DAY. As a so-called pacifist I want to explain that what—

Mr. DITTER. I yielded for a question.

Mrs. O'DAY. Does the gentleman understand that those who are opposed to war are willing to yield to the President power over any amount of appropriations for constructive purposes, but not for destructive purposes?

Mr. DITTER. May I ask the gentleman if she feels that the two new battleships included in the present appropriation bill are for constructive or destructive purposes?

Mrs. O'DAY. Destructive purposes.

Mr. DITTER. So the lady takes exception to the administration policy with respect to these two new battleships?

Mrs. O'DAY. The lady does.

Mr. DITTER. May I enlighten the lady by saying these two new battleships came into the appropriation bill presently before the House, not as a result of any hearings on this bill. We did not get one word of testimony in the hearings with respect to these two battleships. They came in entirely at the request of the present administration and through the Naval Establishment; so we give entire credit to the administration for these two destructive factors to which the lady takes such violent exception.

Mrs. O'DAY. Why not give credit for the constructive appropriations also?

Mr. DITTER. Of course, may I say to the gentlewoman and the other Members of the Committee, in my opinion, this Navy, second to none, is a constructive factor. I just wanted to get the lady's opinion with respect to destructive and constructive.

I am profoundly impressed with the fact that this present Navy bill and the present naval program, with the exception of some few items, is a constructive factor which is going to make for the peace of the world and will not in any way endanger or hazard the peace of the world. May I say to the gentlewoman from New York that that is her President's program, so she should join heartily in supporting this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I make just a few further observations? I wonder how many Members of the House are aware of the fact that down in Charlestown, W. Va., there is located a plant called an ordnance plant. I wonder how many know that in this present bill a very considerable sum is included for the maintenance of that dead baby down there in Charlestown, W. Va. It represents an investment of \$25,000,000 and was intended first as a yardstick. I thought that we never had yardsticks until the present administration came into power, but I find that a yardstick for ordnance manufacture was started by a Democratic administration back in the war days. They wanted to measure how much it should cost to manufacture armament and projectiles in the State of Pennsylvania. They tried to create the impression that we Pennsylvanians were making too much money out of our steel mills, so they built a yardstick down there in Charlestown, W. Va.

Do you know what the record shows? It shows that the projectiles that were turned out down there in Charlestown, W. Va., cost twice as much as the contract price of the projectiles which came out of the steel mills of Pennsylvania. It showed that the armor plate they tried to make, but never produced, cost much in excess of what that same armor plate could have been bought for in the steel mills of Pennsylvania. Down there is an investment of \$25,000,000, plus a million or more of maintenance cost, with absolutely nothing to show for the money. It is just one of those yardsticks by which the profits of private industry were supposedly to be measured and which proved a fiasco and a fizzle.

Mr. Chairman, my own conclusion is that probably some of these other yardsticks that the present administration is trying to create to measure the profits of private industry will suffer the same fate and ultimately be in a similar condition to the armament plant down there in West Virginia. Let us sell the plant, let us give it away, if necessary, but in any event let us save the taxpayers the cost of maintaining and policing that plant down there, in which there is not a wheel turning, in which there is not a bit of production going on, which stands there as a magnificent monument to the wrong philosophy that private industry should be measured in the matter of profits by some governmental agency.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing about this Navy bill I want to mention. Ten million dollars was appropriated in the deficiency bill last year for another experiment. It cannot be called a yardstick. The Naval Establishment did not come before the Navy Appropriations Committee, but after the Navy Appropriations Committee had concluded its hearings and after the bill had been passed by the House, surreptitiously the naval group came before the deficiency committee and asked for an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for a floating drydock. Not another country in the world has a floating drydock of this kind. I understand the original plans provided for fireplaces in the officers' quarters of this floating drydock. It was originally to cost \$10,000,000. Now they come before us and tell us that the \$10,000,000 will not pay the bill. There is, therefore, provided an additional \$5,000,000, and the probabilities are that the \$5,000,000 additional will not pay the total cost of this floating drydock.

Mr. Chairman, what is the purpose of the floating drydock? Well, as I understand it, they want to place it out in the Pacific Ocean. It is going to float around out there.

Let us reappropriate this money. Those of you who want to save money, those Democrats who want to go back to your primaries and show that you are for economy, those Democrats who want to go back home and say that you want to carry out that old campaign promise and the old 1932 platform of saving money; in other words, if you want to resurrect that old hope again, join with us Republicans in our program today when we seek to reappropriate this \$10,000,000. You will have a mighty fine argument to make to your people in that event. You may then say, "I was for economy. I tried to save \$10,000,000 of your money." See whether you cannot arrange to have the \$10,000,000 stricken out and have a feather in your cap, and get some credit for these many, many deficiencies that are presently charged against you as a result of the policy of this administration of lack of consideration, and as a result of this spendthrift policy which has characterized every single action of the present administration.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman will secure additional time, I will yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman give the Committee the benefit of what he proposes to do with the \$10,000,000 that he proposes to take away from this floating drydock? Does he propose to put it back in the Treasury, or does he propose to build a drydock on land?

Mr. DITTER. I recognize that we cannot do anything unless the sensible, splendid Democratic majority, such as is represented by my distinguished friend from Georgia, joins with us. Unless they do that, we cannot do anything.

If you will give us your support, we purpose asking that this money be reappropriated for the purpose of a model basin at \$3,500,000, for which, I understand, the gentleman engineered the legislative program through the House, and for which, no doubt, he holds an opinion with respect to the necessity therefor.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. What are you going to do with the \$7,000,000 left?

Mr. DITTER. I want to tell the House that if they do not do this, or if the House decides it cannot go along with this \$10,000,000 of reappropriation which we are going to request, then my friend here is coming in very, very shortly, probably paving the way through the deficiency committee again, for \$3,500,000 additional for a model basin.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am going to offer an amendment on this bill.

Mr. DITTER. Then I assume the gentleman will join with me in supporting this program whereby this \$10,000,000 is to be saved.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all, because I do not propose to let the gentleman, under the guise of economy, jeopardize national defense on the Pacific coast.

Mr. DITTER. I wish I might concur with the gentleman in that. Will he not certainly acknowledge—and I believe he will—that this is purely an experimental proposition; that there is nothing of its kind afloat on the seas under the flag of any nation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman supported the bill when the Congress authorized it last year; and if he will examine the hearings, he will find that Great Britain has a floating drydock and tried to unload it on the United States.

Mr. DITTER. Not of the size or of the kind we propose having.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose is identically the same.

Mr. DITTER. The purpose is the same but on a very much smaller scale and probably on a practical scale; and may I say I supported it at that time because, like a great many other Republicans, we were deluded into believing that the assurance of the gentleman and those identified with the administration could be depended upon, and that the program would cost \$10,000,000 instead of probably double that

amount. We have been confident, because we have had such certainly we are going to correct the error of our ways. We are going to try to show that this disappointment brings us a remarkable degree of confidence in some of the assertions of the gentleman and others identified with this administration. If we have been mistaken, if we have been disappointed, over to a program whereby we will insist on economy—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No; the gentleman can use his own time.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have not any time, and the gentleman controls the time over on his side.

Mr. DITTER. I have just a little time and I am going to use it myself.

Now, just a further word. I want the membership of the House to know something else about this naval appropriation bill. I wonder how many of the Members of the House here know about the operations of the selection board. I wonder how many of you know that officers in the Navy are ruled arbitrarily by a group—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall be pleased to yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee, because I would like to bring these figures to the attention of the House.

As a result of the forced retirements under the action of the selection board in 1921, the cost of these enforced retirements was \$16,034.63. Mark these figures, if you will. By 1936 that cost had increased to \$971,650.23. What does this represent? Year by year you are putting a colossal burden on the shoulders of the taxpayer as a result of the action of the selection board causing involuntary retirements from the service, and these enforced retirements from the service requiring not only payment under retirement to those who are involuntarily separated from the service, but the substitution of additional men who must take their places, thereby increasing the load and putting an additional load upon the naval appropriation bill to carry out the selection board policy.

I feel that the Naval Affairs Committee has a distinct responsibility. I think it should bring in here some legislation to do away with the selection board program. I believe it should come in here and honestly face the facts and tell the people of the country that an expenditure of more than \$971,000 this year—and the amount is increasing every year—has been brought about as a result of the action of this selection board.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I know there are few Members of the House who realize the tremendous load being carried as a result of the selection board, and it is my conviction that the rank and file of the men in the service, with the exception of the few in the top grade, would welcome the opportunity of having this selection board eliminated and permitting instead the same kind of promotion program that is carried on in the Army.

The importance of the bill now before the House cannot be overemphasized. It has more than a domestic significance. It plays an important part in our foreign policy. It involves the question of national defense. It is definitely related to the momentous and critical subject of world peace. A tremendous responsibility devolves upon each of us in the consideration of this measure as we study the justification for the needs of the Naval Establishment and weigh the evidence presented by those charged with the administration of naval affairs. The far-reaching effects of our naval policy—of which this appropriation bill is a part—should be recognized by every Member of the House. It is necessary that we consider pertinent facts if we are to arrive at an honest and impartial decision.

Neither sectionalism nor partisanship should influence our conclusions. We should dismiss all thought of North or South, of East or West. We should forego our sense of loyalty to industry or to agriculture. We should avoid a

spirit of allegiance to one political party or to another, and without rancor or bitterness or prejudice direct our attention to the problem as a common problem, the successful solution of which will bring a lasting satisfaction to us and a benediction to those who will follow after us.

There are differences of opinion on the question of the safest course to pursue in order to continue at peace with the nations of the world. There can be no doubt of our desire for peace. The record of our actions is eloquent testimony of our ambitions. Many men and women are apprehensive that the present naval policy will prove conducive to conflict rather than a deterrent of war. I cannot concur with this conclusion. I attribute the highest motives to those who honestly champion the cause of peace and who, actuated by lofty purposes and a noble idealism, seek to stop a competitive armaments race, but I am not persuaded that the course which they advocate will lead to the attainment of the desired goal.

We have in our midst those who would make disarmament a vehicle for the advancement of their own selfish interests and for the development of class prejudice and discontent. Protestations of a willingness to appropriate billions of dollars for a favored class or for a favored project in order to gain political popularity and at the same time a vehement denouncement of reasonable efforts to provide an adequate national defense, raise a grave doubt of the bona fides of the protestants. It smacks much of demagoguery. I loathe the demagogue who proclaims tenets of pacifism for the Nation in order that he may arouse social animosities and the discontent of class hatreds among our people. I insist that it should not be possible for financial interests to marshal the manhood of America to aid in maneuvers of aggrandizement, but raising a hue and cry about munition makers, potent as such hue and cry may be to excite popular wrath, will never allay suspicions, destroy doubts, or heal the festering sores of old animosities. Taking the profits out of war will not take the venom out of hate. Demagoguery depends upon deceit for its appeal. It thrives on deception. Intrigue is essential to its effectiveness. Its heart is a throbbing dynamo of malice, hatred, and vindictiveness. It is the very antithesis of peace and good will. Demagoguery never creates. It always destroys. The demagogue takes on the mantle of peace to hide his subtle machinations. He is the willing ally of and fluent conspirator with subversive leaders of dangerous movements of sedition and revolution. The demagogue in his role of an inciter has no claim either to our patience or confidence. To this group I tender neither an explanation of nor a reason for the present needs of the naval establishment. They have neither the right to expect nor the right to demand them. They would neither accept nor approve them. As enemies within our gates they deserve only our disdain and avoidance.

Honest men—and I might say altruistic men—may have differences of opinion as to the methods which should be pursued to reach a certain objective. As for myself, I yield to no man in a desire for world peace, and particularly in a desire that the United States may be saved from any possible involvement in the disturbing conditions prevailing in Europe today. My hopes are just as intense, my aspirations are just as genuine, my prayers are just as fervent as the hopes and aspirations and prayers of the most-devoted disciple dedicated to the cause of peace among the nations of the world. But, sad as it is to relate, most of us acknowledge that hopes and aspirations are frustrated and that prayers are unavailing when nations commit themselves to a program of aggression and plunder. Unfortunately, war is a horrible reality. I am afraid that it will continue to be a reality until the discordant notes of human frailties are brought into harmony with the music of eternal verities. Men and nations continue to be selfish, avaricious, pugnacious, and quarrelsome. Until the hearts of men are changed these traits of men will remain, and as long as they remain, the peace of the world will be threatened. I claim common ground with all conscientious, practical endeavorers whose hearts are thrilled with the hope for the establishment of good will, friendship, and understanding.

But in view of the attitude of other nations and in the light of our experiences, what should our position be? Can we be unmindful of the serious aspects of world conditions? Should we substitute the unrealized dreams of disappointed idealists for the actual experiences of everyday life? Can our sense of national self-respect countenance a complete disregard of the contingencies which have been created? Should we invite difficulties by courting a spirit of complacency and by refusing to acknowledge the existence of proven facts?

Out of the cataclysm of the World War there came new convictions and new hopes for world peace. Not only the horrors of war but the price of war had made an impression upon us. We discussed the causes, the sacrifices, the sorrows, and the incalculable costs of the conflict, and to most men there came an abiding conviction of the utter futility of such struggles. The enormity and wantonness of destruction impelled men everywhere to seek for an avenue of escape from a possible repetition of the catastrophe. We had indulged in an orgy of destruction, we were anxious for opportunities of construction. From all sides came the cry for the lifting of the crushing burden of debt under which all nations staggered. Convincingly there came to us the realization of the absurdity of permitting passions and prejudice to rule when reason and judgment might be supreme. A new hope was born in the hearts of men that frankness and cooperation and understanding would be the new order among the nations of the world.

With this conviction and hope we addressed ourselves to a solution of the problem in a practical way. The Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armaments was the conscientious endeavor on the part of the United States to destroy the lurking suspicions out of which misunderstandings so often arise, to translate into a glorious reality the idealism toward which the finer sensibilities of men point the way, and to invite and offer the fullest degree of cooperation to the other nations for the adoption of proposals, free of intrigue and deception, which would result in a reduction of the means for war and in an increase of enjoyment of the arts of peace. We urged upon the conferees that the time had passed for inquiry and investigation and that the time had arrived for positive action. We insisted that the heart of the problem was competition in naval construction and that if the problem was to be solved competition must be abandoned. We recognized that the purposes of the conference could not be attained without sacrifices and advocated a cessation of building programs, even though it entailed heavy losses for ships under construction. As an evidence of our honesty of purpose and of the genuineness of our desires we put into execution our spirit at the conference by scrapping our finest men of war at a loss of almost \$200,000,000. I submit that actions speak louder than words and that history does not record a finer example of the willingness to sacrifice for a practical solution of a world problem than the voluntary destruction of battle-ships by the United States following the Washington Conference in 1922. At Geneva, in 1927, and again at London in 1930, our efforts were directed toward an extension of the disarmament program and toward a larger appreciation of the value of peace. Reference need hardly be made to the outcome of the conference recently held in London and from which conference our representatives have just returned. Suffice it to say that the picture is dismal and disappointing. The future is foreboding. But we can claim leadership in an endeavor and a continuity of endeavor which would have tranquilized the world had the same spirit of sincerity and honesty and frankness characterized the purposes of other nations as that which was manifested by this country. Our plea for disarmament has been rejected.

For this we are in no way to blame. Disappointed and disillusioned, we have but one course left, to provide an adequate national defense of which the Navy must be the foremost factor.

We had been led to believe that the World War was a war to end wars, and that we were to make the world safe

for democracy. We have been disappointed in both of these hopes. Dictatorships today threaten democracy and the world has again become an armed camp. Each week brings new fears and forebodings. Treaties, pacts, agreements, and covenants appear to be but idle gestures or shameful conventionalities as one nation after another repudiates its solemn obligations whenever its policies are questioned or its plans are opposed. Compliance with the mandates of the League of Nations might well be compared with the efforts at enforcement of that constitutional amendment which is remembered today as a noble experiment. With due solemnity decrees are made only to provide an opportunity for skillful diplomats to find an excuse for not enforcing them. The agility with which the executioner can ease its way out of an undesirable situation speaks well for foreign diplomacy even though it makes of the League a travesty and a farce. Sanctions are synonymous with suspicions. Our fondest hopes have been dashed to the ground as ruthless dictators have built gigantic machines of ruin to arouse a spirit of nationalism among their people to assure these masters an undistributed dominion over their subjects and to threaten by force the acceptance by other nations of their absolute demands. We have witnessed an increasing contemptuous indifference to international morality, and where there is no sense of morality there can be no security in agreements nor hope of understandings. Such are the problems as I see them. Such are the conditions with which we are confronted. What course should we follow?

With our hopes of understanding dissipated and our sense of security in agreements destroyed, what course can America pursue which will be compatible with national safety and what course should the Congress take in order to discharge our obligation to provide for the common defense? Shall we attempt to find safety by withdrawing from our contacts with other nations? "No man liveth unto himself" and no nation can live successfully unto itself. Isolation means stagnation and decadence. The recluse arouses our sympathy as he closes the doors of fellowship and deprives himself of the wealth of kindness, inspiration, and helpfulness which springs from associations and friendships. Scrooge was a pathetic figure before the ghost of Marley visited him. A nation which shuns intercourse with other nations and holds itself aloof from contacts becomes even more pathetic. We cannot ignore world movements nor dissociate ourselves from tragedies enacted on the stage where we as a nation must play a leading role. The initiative, the ingenuity, the courage of America cannot be confined. We are a world power and as such must face facts, not fancies; we must deal in realities, not dreams; we must be practical, not idealistic.

I contend that we have an obligation to provide for the common defense. I contend that our primary duty is preparedness, if we are to enjoy a sense of self-protection. I contend that we should be able to command respect and not invite scorn and derision. I contend that we can bring a larger degree of influence upon world affairs and bring our contribution for world peace more effectively by self-assertiveness than by assuming an attitude of passive acquiescence. I contend that at this time an adequate national defense provides the best assurance of peace for America.

An adequate national defense depends primarily on an adequate naval establishment, and an adequate naval establishment must include modern equipment on the sea and in the air, strategic shore stations, and an efficient complement of officers and enlisted personnel trained and ready to execute a program in any emergency. The present bill provides for such a naval establishment. Some of us may take exception to some items, but, as a whole, the appropriations provided for in the bill represent the reasonable requirements of a naval program which has been authorized by the acts of Congress, which has been approved by a majority of the people of the country, and which is requisite for our national needs under present war conditions. We are building, equipping, and manning a treaty Navy. To do otherwise at this time would be folly. It would insure a repetition of the

unpreparedness debacle of World War days and invite disaster. Contemporary events constitute an added and pointed lesson on the plight of a nation weak and unprepared for an emergency. I believe we should have a Navy comparable to the navy of any other nation of the world. I believe we should have this Navy as the most effective means of insuring peace for America. I believe that the present bill is the means of paying the premium for the necessary insurance policy for our safety and protection.

To be at peace with the other nations of the world is our fondest hope and our sincere purpose. To this end our every endeavor should be dedicated and it is my abiding conviction that a navy second to none constitutes a dedication to this cause. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have the pleasure of introducing in the House today a House companion measure to Senator BARBOUR's valuable bill, Senate 4031, which is entitled:

A bill to create a commission to enter into negotiations with respect to the refunding of certain obligations for foreign governments held by the United States, and for other purposes.

This bill calls for creation of a World War debt refunding commission. The commission would consist of five members, one of whom would be the Secretary of the Treasury, who would serve as chairman. The other four shall be, according to the bill, appointed by the President, by and with the advice of the Senate.

The commission would be authorized to enter into agreements with foreign governments with a view to refunding or converting the obligations of such foreign governments now held by the United States arising out of the World War into bonds or other obligations of these governments in substitution for the bonds or other obligations now held by the United States. The term, form, conditions, date or dates of maturity, and the rate or rates of interest will also be established by the commission, with such security, if any, as shall be deemed for the best interests of our country.

The bill also provides that the commission shall make a report to the President and the Congress in January of each year of its activities under this act. The report shall include also recommendations from the commission in the matters to which this act relates. The commission shall make a final report on the termination of its activities. It shall also transmit to the Congress immediately copies of each agreement entered into with a foreign government under the act, but no such agreement shall become effective until further action by the Congress.

The bill provides also the commission shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 3 years after the date of enactment.

So much for the mechanics of this measure. Let me point out to you just briefly its very evident and valuable features.

In the first place, it is imperative that something be done—and done soon—to have amortized our loans to our Allies in the World War. This bill suggests one way to do it. I believe, after careful study of the means suggested in the measure, you will agree that this momentous problem can only be solved by thorough and diligent investigation through a commission such as this bill would create. Having the Secretary of the Treasury as its chairman, we can be assured the commission would act entirely in accordance with the foreign policy of the Executive. With the President selecting the four other members of this commission, that assurance is strengthened. This commission is given, under this measure, full and specific power to act "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." This is entirely as it should be.

Furthermore, the Executive is more thoroughly protected by the wording of the second section of the bill, which says:

Subject to the approval of the President, the commission is authorized to enter into negotiations.

The Congress is protected in that the measure declares that a yearly report shall be made to the Congress; that all agreements suggested shall be printed and transmitted to the Congress before any such agreement shall become effective.

One of the most valuable features of the bill is that the commission shall cease to exist upon the expiration of 3 years after enactment. We have seen entirely too unwieldy a bureaucracy created in our National Government. The act, by disbanding the commission within 3 years, gives us the certainty that we shall get quick and impartial action.

Our American taxpayers have suffered long enough under the financial burden imposed by the defaults of the foreign governments. It seems to me that insufficient emphasis has been placed lately on the war-debt situation. Now is the time to demand, and to get, action looking toward the refunding of the just and overdue obligations of our debtor Allies.

When the United States entered the World War we were hailed as the "saviors of liberty." Our Allies welcomed the manpower we threw into the conflict. They welcomed our munitions, our ships, our equipment. Moreover, they welcomed our money. Most of our boys, thank God, came back. Practically none of our money did.

It is regrettable that many of our former Allies see fit to belittle the contribution the United States made toward winning the war. Four million of our best young manhood was sent abroad. They were fresh, young, trained troops. They were thrown into the breach and the histories of today record the valor, the courage, and indomitable will to conquer, which they manifested. Our equipment came at a time when the Allies were frantically in need of it. Our money went to them at a time when they were desperate for funds.

I believe it is not too much to say that were it not for the entrance of the United States into the World War, France, England, and perhaps Italy and some other nations would today be vassal states, and would have lost their liberty if not their sovereignty.

The nations which we aided—Belgium, France, England, Russia, and Italy—can never repay us in dollars and cents for what the preservation of their freedom cost us in blood and treasure. Our entry into the conflict stemmed the tide which had been flowing steadily against the Allies. Our entry formed the turning point of the war. We can rightly say that it is due to us, and to us alone, that these countries were able to keep their places in the sun.

Besides our investment in manpower and equipment, we spent millions of our own money on our share of the war. When we entered the war our national debt was about \$1,000,000,000. At the close of the war we had increased the national debt to more than twenty-six billions.

This was the money we spent as our personal share of the cost of the war, and does not include the tremendous loans we made to foreign countries.

It is to be remembered and stressed that the United States practically charged nothing to its Allies for munitions, implements of war, and the costs of the conflict. The loans which we know as war debts are primarily commercial loans.

The foreign nations who are branding our people as usurers forget the fact that we forgave them very substantial parts of their loans. For instance, we were owed over four billions and a half dollars by the British Government. Of that, when we refunded for them, we forgave a billion and a half, or 30 percent of the loan. France owed us originally four billions two hundred and thirty millions, and we forgave them two billions and a half, or 60 percent. Italy, which owed us two billion a hundred and fifty million, was forgiven to the extent of a billion seven hundred million, or 80 percent of the loan. Belgium, although she only owed us four hundred and eighty-three millions, was forgiven three hundred millions, or 60 percent of the loan.

Usurers do not "forgive" debts. Such forgiveness was the act of a friendly nation willing and ready to cooperate with its Allies to help them establish themselves on a firm financial footing.

Such benefactions should have earned for us the gratitude of the European countries we saved from vassalage. If they are duly grateful, they are exhibiting their gratitude in strange ways, first by defaulting on their debts and then calling us "usurers" for trying to collect them.

There is no precedent in the history of this country for the kind of treatment we have received from our debtor allies. At the close of the Revolutionary War, President Washington and Secretary of the Treasury Hamilton assured our creditors that they would be paid in full and with interest. France is now one of our debtors. She has defaulted. How would she have felt if we had defaulted the loans she made us during the Revolutionary War? It is history that France made the loans to us then, not because of any great love for America but because we were fighting her ancient enemy, England. She was willing to do all she could for the sole purpose of weakening England—and not for the purpose of helping the United States. Yet we paid our debt to her with interest. In contrast to that consider the France of today, which borrowed our money to preserve its own liberty, and for no other reason, and then refuses to pay back its loans!

Europe sometimes makes the excuse that America made profit from its loans. That is the excuse of the dishonest debtor. How can we make profit from a loan that was not repaid, either in principal or in interest?

It is to be remembered and emphasized that a great percentage of these so-called war-debt loans were commercial transactions. A large part of the money was loaned after the war was over. These nations borrowed from us for the purpose of rehabilitating themselves. There was then "no common enemy" to face. The war was over. Peace reigned once more and ravaged Europe was trying to reestablish itself. For that purpose they borrowed more money from a gullible and free-handed United States. This part of the war debts has gone into default along with that which was loaned them while the conflict still raged.

Were these nations unable to pay us, we could treat them as insolvent debtors. However, they are more than able to comfortably repay the United States. The only thing that stops them from making repayment is the evident and total lack of desire to repay. They prefer, naturally, to permit our taxpayers to assume the burden which should be theirs. They apparently feel no shame for such dishonesty. Their only feeling on the question of the war debts is a resentment that we should even expect to be repaid.

Let us investigate the ability of these nations to repay. We have used England, France, Belgium, and Italy as examples thus far. To continue the comparison, if the British people wanted to fully and completely repay the United States, they would only have to give us 4 cents of each dollar now expended by their Government. I do not believe there is an individual in this country who, to clear up an honest obligation, would not be willing to put aside 4 cents from each dollar he spends to take care of that debt. There is no logical reason why any nation should be less honorable than a private creditor.

To continue, Italy would only have to pay us 1.3 cents from every dollar she spends for governmental purposes; and France and Belgium would only have to pay us 2 cents each for each dollar they spend.

Think for a moment what it would mean to our tax-burdened people were these foreign governments to repay us the war-debt money. The municipalities of the Empire State have a funded debt of about three billions two hundred millions. Figuring that this State pays one-fifth of the Federal taxes, it would receive from payments of the war debts about \$3,000,000,000—enough to wipe out the debts of all the municipalities in that State. What is true in the Empire State will be true in all of the other 47 States of the Union. Prompt and honorable payment of the war debts would go a long way to removing many of our taxation worries.

The attitude of our Government during the various administrations since the World War, including the present one, has been most charitable and kind toward our debtors. In fact, it has been too charitable and too kind. If this war-

debt money we loaned Europe were something we had obtained by a wave of a magic financial wand, we could view the defaults of our debtors with equanimity, if not with satisfaction. However, this money is not something we pulled like rabbits from a financial hat. It is the money of our American taxpayers. If the European countries do not make good the loans, our taxpayers must.

These debts must be paid. The issue today is whether our Government is going to ask the foreign countries to repay them or whether they will insist on saddling them on our own taxpayers. There is no middle choice. Either Europe pays its own debts or our people pay for them. I do not believe it is right for any administration to permit its taxpayers to assume another country's burdens. France, Great Britain, Italy, and the rest can pay.

We are hearing in the daily papers of the tremendous unrest abroad. Europe is a tinder box which is liable to flame into another horrible war any moment. Nation is arming against nation. Bitterness and international strife are in the air. How can European peoples permit themselves to be drawn into another war when they have not yet paid for the last one?

England spent during the past fiscal year \$686,736,147 for armaments of all kinds. France spent \$688,584,175; Italy, \$956,399,400; and Belgium, \$231,317,447. Their payments on the war debts this year, if they were made, would amount to \$9,720,765.95 for Great Britain, \$3,046,879.72 for France, \$896,155.88 for Italy, and \$484,453.88 for Belgium. In other words, to pay their installments on the war debts this year these countries would only have to pay a percentage of the money they are now spending on armaments alone. The percentage Great Britain would have to pay would be only one-hundredth of 1 percent; for France it would be four-thousandths of 1 percent; for Italy nine-tenths of 1 percent; and for Belgium two-thousandths of 1 percent. Let me impress upon you that these percentages are based on the best obtainable and authentic figures at this time and represent the percentage of their war-debt payments as against the money they are now spending for armaments. What is true for these countries mentioned is largely true for all our debtors.

I believe the resolution by Senator BARBOUR, for which I have today introduced a House companion, would go a long way toward solving, in a friendly, equitable manner, our war-debt problem. The need for such a solution is immediate. We cannot permit our taxpayers to any longer assume the debts of these foreign nations. With the help of you gentlemen this war-debt problem will be effectively solved, and the American taxpayer will be relieved of at least a part of the tremendous burden he is now carrying.

On behalf of the taxpayers, on behalf of our country, I solicit the aid and cooperation of every Member of the House to effect the solution of our war debts.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in the 2 minutes allotted to me I want to briefly refer to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] in reference to the selective law. Let me call attention to the fact that the selective law was passed years ago, when the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Butler, was chairman of the committee. At that time it was, and still is, the opinion of those who are well informed about it that it is the most fair and equitable system ever devised in reference to promotion and retirement.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] pointed out that the legislation ought to follow the Army plan. What is the difference? Briefly, it is this: Stagnation was so bad in the Army—lieutenants had reached the age of 40 and 50 years and could not be promoted until Congress came in with a blanket promotion of six or seven thousand Army officers.

The merit system enters into the selective system of the Navy. It does not give the ranking officer a promotion; he is not promoted when some officer above him retires or dies.

I submit that the selection law is a fair and equitable method of grouping the officers, taking the list of names of certain officers, and determining who is best fitted for the next in command. As years go on it will be in the interest of economy instead of a burden on the taxpayer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Will the chairman of the committee yield to the gentleman from Georgia in order that I may ask him a question?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia 1 minute.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he would acknowledge that the Army plan might provide a more equitable and fairer system and also entail less expense to the taxpayer?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On the contrary, if you retire a man at a youthful age instead of 64, where under the law they get 2½ percent of the basic pay, it is more economical.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman will acknowledge that we have a board of men forcing into retirement officers that would not otherwise be forced into retirement?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is absolutely true.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I yield that time to myself, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I announced yesterday that every member of the naval subcommittee and every member of the Committee on Appropriations profoundly regretted the inability of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy Department, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], to be present and handle this bill. I suppose I feel his absence perhaps more keenly than any other member of the subcommittee, because, of necessity, I was called upon to take charge of this bill and handle it in his absence. I recognize full well my inability to take his place or to handle the bill in the House as he would have done if he could have been here.

The Budget estimate of appropriations for the next fiscal year for the Navy Department carries a larger amount for the Navy than has been appropriated for the current fiscal year. The current appropriation bill, including reappropriations, carried \$489,275,975. For 1937 the Budget proposes \$549,591,299, which is an increase over the appropriations for this fiscal year of \$60,315,324. We have effected net reductions totaling \$18,522,592. The total of our bill is therefore \$531,068,707, or an increase over the appropriations for the current fiscal year of \$41,792,732.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake in the remaining few minutes to cover in detail all the items of this bill. I do, however, desire to call to the attention of the members of the Committee certain items involved in this measure. Much of this increase we are called upon to consider is caused by two things, namely, new legislation and taking up projects inadequately financed by allotments of relief funds. As to the latter, \$31,951,000 is carried in this bill, not for the completion, but toward the completion of 32 vessels started under an N. R. A. allotment of \$238,000,000. This allotment, it appears, will be about \$59,000,000 short of the amount needed for the completion of those vessels, including the provision of ordnance spares and reserves. We are also carrying in this bill funds to complete a number of radio stations initially provided for with N. R. A. allotments.

Of course, this bill very largely is beyond our control as an appropriating committee. Our naval policy is established pursuant to law by the administration. We have committed ourselves to the maintenance of a Navy of a certain size; that extends to ships, aircraft, to personnel, and to the shore establishment. The task of our committee, as I see it, is to see

that the appropriations are held to the bare minimum necessary to provide and support such a Navy consistent with good business judgment and ordinary common sense.

As previously indicated, the Budget estimates for the Navy exceed the sum of current appropriations, including in the latter reappropriations amounting to \$7,544,596, by \$60,315,324.

This increase divides, generally and roundly, as follows:

Personnel, Regular Navy and Marine Corps and Reserve forces	\$20,000,000
Maintenance and operation of the Navy, exclusive of service personnel	6,500,000
Construction of ships	49,500,000

The principal offset against this increase is in the estimate for public works, which is, roundly, \$14,000,000 less than the amount that has been made available for the present fiscal year.

The personnel increase is incident to several factors. I only intend to mention a few of them:

(1) Increasing enlisted strength of Navy from 93,500 to 100,000..... \$10,527,114

That is due partly to the policy to which we are committed of maintaining 85-percent complements on all combatant vessels and on submarines 100-percent complements, and to additional vessels that will be in commission during 1937—an average of 319.6 as against 312.3 this year—and also to vessels coming into commission early in the fiscal year 1938, for which crews will have to be assembled in advance.

We have reduced the estimate for pay of men by \$949,103 because we found too many in the higher pay grades. What was considered to be a proper grade distribution of enlisted men of treaty-navy strength was incorporated in last year's hearings, and we found that said distribution had not been adhered to in the preparation of the 1937 Budget, and we had the estimate recalculated to conform with that treaty-navy distribution, with the result that we get a saving of \$949,103.

(2) Five appointments to the Naval Academy..... \$589,937

Permanent law authorizes five appointments. By limitation the number was held to three over a long period of years; raised to four one year; put back to three the next; raised to four last year; and for next year the Budget proposes that the controlling limitation be dropped, which automatically would make the number five. We have not had five appointments since the fiscal year 1923.

We are disregarding the Budget and making provision for four.

There has been so much dissatisfaction over the selection arrangement, both in and out of the Navy, that the General Board has been making a study of the whole subject, and we are advised has come to conclusions which will be laid before Congress at the next session, which if approved will reduce separations and make five appointments unnecessary. As a matter of fact, the Navy Department has submitted within the last few days to the Bureau of the Budget a recommendation for a modification of the Budget estimate to provide for four instead of five appointments to Annapolis.

There would be an additional expense in connection with five appointments to provide for more dormitory space. The Budget includes \$147,000 for beginning the work, which would cost to complete \$750,000. The \$147,000 and the other amounts we have eliminated by adhering to four appointments make a total of \$441,609. Some of the Budget increase has been permitted to stand because of an estimated larger number of students on the four-appointment basis than first appeared likely.

(3) Normal increases incident to longevity and retirement, Navy and Marine Corps..... \$6,920,763

This increase is incident to promotion, higher pay periods, 5-percent pay increase after 3 years' service, growing retired lists, and a greater number of transferred enlisted men. There is a total of \$3,426,902 in the estimate because of a bigger retired list and a larger number of transferred men. By transferred men I mean enlisted men who transfer to the Naval Reserve after 16 or 20 years' service.

I feel that I should call attention again to the growing cost of transferred members of the Naval Reserve; that is, enlisted men of the Navy who transfer to the Naval Reserve after 16 or 20 years' service. The law, as amended, requires 20 years' service as to those men enlisting after such amendment. After the combined service in the Regular Navy and in the Naval Reserve of such transferred men equals 30 years they become eligible for the retired list. The estimate for pay of transferred men—15,742—for 1937 is \$13,790,890 and for retired enlisted men—5,748—\$6,891,254. The two combined exceed the sum of the current year appropriations by \$2,507,063. Serious consideration might well be given to the repeal of the transfer law, which of itself defeats building up a most effective and inexpensive reserve through men not reenlisting who now are induced to remain in the service to earn, after 20 years' service, an annuity of \$1,135 average until they reach a retired status, and \$1,248 average after being retired.

We have added \$84,220 to meet the expense of the bill just sent to the President for approval amending the Marine Corps Personnel Act of 1934.

(4) Expansion of Reserve activities, Navy and Marine Corps \$1,719,720

If you will turn to page 195 of the hearings, you will find a break-down of the Naval Reserve increase, and on page 658 there is an itemization of the increase touching the Marine Corps Reserve.

As to the latter, the committee has made a net increase of \$16,234, which represents an addition of \$48,307 for pay for the aviation branch and a reduction of \$32,073 in the project to give 45 days' training to college students with a view to developing a force of 650 platoon leaders, which the committee feels should be obtained more gradually.

Of the net increase of \$1,437,175 for Naval Reserve activities, the committee has deducted \$921,531, all itemized on page 6 of the report. I invite your attention to that list.

The estimate for naval ship construction is \$182,500,000. Of that amount, \$168,519,631 is intended for carrying forward work on or completing 88 vessels.

There will be available for expenditure on account of such vessels, in addition to the appropriation now asked, \$33,397,868 of prior year appropriations and an amount upward of \$26,000,000 of the N. R. A. allotment of \$238,000,000, or a total availability for expenditure on account of such vessels of \$227,917,499. We have reduced the total estimate by \$14,000,000.

There was much objection last year when the committee proposed to reduce the estimate of \$152,500,000 by \$14,690,000. We have found that there will be a balance at the end of this fiscal year of about \$19,000,000 in excess of the amount we proposed to reduce the estimate.

For laying down new ships the Budget includes \$13,980,369 on account of 12 destroyers and 6 submarines, to cost in all \$113,958,000. Each of the destroyers is estimated to cost \$6,463,000 and each of the submarines \$6,067,000.

All of this new construction is in continuation of the program to provide replacements for destroyers and submarines which have become over age, and is in keeping with the policy to have the Navy of treaty strength in under-age ships.

After the 12 destroyers we are providing for here, we shall still need to build 23 to give us our treaty allowance of 150,000 tons, all under age.

Our treaty allowance of submarines is 52,700 tons. After the six we are providing for in this bill we shall need to build eight more to have all of our submarines under age.

With these smaller vessels out of the way we shall be in very fine shape. We are building replacements now for 2 of the 10 light cruisers of the *Omaha* class. None of the other eight comes up for replacement before 1940.

As to our 15 battleships, the replacements for 3 may be laid down in 1937; then they come along, 4 in 1939, 1 in 1940, and so forth.

Since the presentation of the Budget there has been concluded another naval conference from which has issued a

new naval treaty, signed by the plenipotentiaries of our own Government and the Governments of France and Great Britain on March 25, 1936. The Washington Treaty, signed February 6, 1922, fixed the life of a battleship at 20 years. The London Naval Treaty, signed April 22, 1930, suspended the replacement of battleships during the life of that treaty, which expires December 31, 1936. The new naval treaty provides that a capital ship becomes over age 26 years after its completion. However, after December 31, 1936, under the new treaty, if ratified, there will be no prohibition upon laying down new capital ships between 17,500 and 35,000 tons, and, if not ratified, no prohibition whatsoever as to ships of any category or character.

Applying the 26-year principle and the further principle of the Washington Treaty permitting the laying down of replacement tonnage 3 years before the vessels they replace become over age, we have three battleships the replacement of which may be commenced at any time in the calendar year 1937, namely, the *Arkansas*, which will have been completed 26 years in 1938, and the *Texas* and *New York*, which will have been completed 26 years in 1940.

In view of the freedom of action permissible as to battleship replacement after December 31, 1936, and the evident determination of our Government, voiced in the Vinson-Trammell Act of March 27, 1934, and in subsequent legislation, to maintain a navy second to none, the committee feels that the means should be available for matching any battleship construction that may be undertaken by any of the other signatory powers to the London Treaty, signed April 22, 1930, or to the new treaty, signed March 25, 1936. The committee is unwilling to recommend that our Navy Department be given authority to go ahead with the replacement of battleships without restriction.

Our Government, which has taken the lead in moves to contribute to the maintenance of the general peace and to reduce the burdens of competition in armament, should be the last to take the initiative. We are proposing to meet such a contingency in this way:

Not more than two capital ships, as replacements of average capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that capital ship replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament signed at London, April 22, 1930.

There is one other matter I think I should bring to your attention. You will find on page 430 of the hearings a statement of the estimated additional cost to the Navy during the fiscal year 1937 of the new leave legislation which just recently was enacted. The estimated additional load is \$8,348,869, which will have to be absorbed or provided for later in the way of a supplemental appropriation. It would be rather interesting to have the figure as to the entire Federal service.

Mr. Chairman, my time is running short and I shall have to conclude, but before doing so, I wish to express my appreciation for the splendid cooperation I have received from my colleagues on the subcommittee and for the cordial support I have had thus far from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is chairman of the Naval Legislative Committee, and from his very able committee colleague the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]. I also want to express my profound thanks and appreciation to the able and efficient clerk to our subcommittee, Mr. Pugh.

I shall be glad to contribute any additional information that may be desired as to the bill when it is read under the 5-minute rule. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For traveling expenses of civilian employees, including not to exceed \$2,500 for the expenses of attendance, at home and abroad, upon meetings of technical, professional, scientific, and other similar organizations when, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, such attendance would be of benefit in the conduct of the work of the Navy Department; not to exceed \$2,000 for the part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or

elsewhere of such experts and at such rates of compensation as may be contracted for by and in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy; expenses of courts martial, purchase of law and reference books, expenses of prisoners and prisons, courts of inquiry, boards of investigation, examining boards, clerical assistance; witnesses' fees and traveling expenses; not to exceed \$15,000 for promoting accident prevention and safety in shore establishments of the Navy, to be expended in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy; newspapers and periodicals for the naval service; all advertising of the Navy Department and its bureaus (except advertising for recruits for the Bureau of Navigation); costs of suits; relief of vessels in distress; recovery of valuables from shipwrecks; maintenance of attachés abroad, including office rental and pay of employees, and not to exceed \$8,000 in the aggregate or \$900 for any one person for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 118a); the collection and classification of information; not to exceed \$185,000 for telephone, telegraph, and teletype rentals and tolls, telegrams, radiograms, and cablegrams; postage, foreign and domestic and post-office box rentals; necessary expenses for interned persons and prisoners of war under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, including funeral expenses for such interned persons or prisoners of war as may die while under such jurisdiction; payment of claims for damages as provided in the act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year 1920, approved July 11, 1919 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 600); and other necessary and incidental expenses; in all, \$1,132,500: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the expense of any naval district in which there may be an active navy yard, naval training station, or naval operating base, unless the commandant of the naval district shall be also the commandant of one of such establishments: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$515,000.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this naval appropriation bill and am going to vote against it. I know there is no hope of defeating this exorbitant naval appropriation, but I do feel that I must make my protest not only against this bill but against the whole procedure by which this has been handled. Here is a bill for over a half billion dollars—surely a sum worthy of great consideration. Yet what are we asked to do? We were given this bill with the report yesterday afternoon and were graciously allowed the privilege of even reading the printed hearings on the bill, the object being to read the bill, report, and hearings while the debate is going on. That is a fine way to prepare to vote on a half billion dollars. And today we are expected to vote.

Now, for several weeks I have been calling the Appropriations Committee, hoping to be able to get a copy of the bill, hearings, and report in time to give it all the study it deserves. Being no more than an average fast reader, I have not even been able to read the bill, report, and hearings. We were prepared to spend all this week on the tax bill, and yet we get this bill crammed down our throats. It might be the best bill in the world, or it might be the worst, but there is surely not sufficient time to make a careful study to formulate an accurate judgment.

With this bill America has finally jumped into the armament race with both feet, politely claiming that it is no race but a mere desire to keep even. Why this unprecedented expenditure, and against whom are we arming? Just a glance over the record is enough to convince any sane man that something vital is wrong. If we are going to spend our money, let us take the time to make sure that we are getting something for it. We hear a lot about economy, and yet I can find nothing in the bill to indicate that there is any intention to cut down the excessive expenditures on the Atlantic seaboard naval bases. For years it has been advocated that only the bases at New York, Philadelphia, Washington, and Norfolk need be continued. In late years our naval problems have all centered on the Pacific, yet we are content to continue seven navy yards on the Atlantic seaboard. Our bid for commercial supremacy is primarily in the Pacific. Thus, either war or peace tactics would indicate the justice of the contention that much economy could be practiced.

Loud wails are heard that because of reduced appropriations since the war we have been unable to maintain our

Navy and keep it at treaty strength. Competent officials say that is so, but I challenge anyone to find out why it is so.

The period during which we lost so badly apparently was from 1923 through 1934. For those years our naval appropriations amounted to \$4,052,000,000; Great Britain, \$3,342,000,000; Japan, \$1,657,000,000; France, \$937,000,000.

This armament race seems to be divided into two heats; the United States wins the first heat in that we are able to spend more money, but we run a poor third in the second heat, which is in getting something for our money.

This is a regular appropriation, not a relief measure. It is part of the housekeeping expenses of our Government—one more burden upon the average taxpayer. At a time when we are concentrating every effort toward the relief of unemployment and protecting millions of our citizens from the tragedy of actual starvation we can well consider how we spend our substance. Adequate national defense? Yes. Ever-increasing and practically unlimited expenditures? No. [Applause.]

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia has expressed regret that an appropriation for national defense should be the subject of partisan controversy. I would call his attention to the fact that the Democratic Party has itself made it a partisan issue, for in its 1932 platform his party declared for—

A Navy and Army adequate for national defense based on a survey of all facts affecting the existing establishments, that the people in time of peace may not be burdened by an expenditure fast approaching \$1,000,000,000 annually.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I yield.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman has quoted from the Democratic platform. He has stated that the Democratic Party made it a partisan issue. Will not the gentleman be so fair as to quote the Republican platform on the same subject showing they made it a partisan issue?

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. If I had the Republican platform at hand, I should be glad to quote its plank on armaments. I would suggest that the gentleman himself might be able to furnish the language.

Mr. BIERMANN. I shall do so.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I would ask him to do it in his own time, however, because I have only 5 minutes.

The plank I read was the Democratic promise. What was the performance? Has there been the reduction in military and naval appropriations impliedly pledged in the platform?

In this, as in many other matters, the record shows that the promise has been kept—in reverse.

In 1934 naval expenditures were \$297,029,000, and in 1935, \$436,448,000. The naval appropriation for 1936 was \$483,468,000, and the 1937 Budget calls for \$551,308,000.

The naval Budget for 1937 exceeds the expenditures for 1934 by \$254,279,000. Military and naval expenditures for 1937 will be more than \$1,000,000,000, even if the administration does not divert a single dollar of "relief funds" to military and naval purposes next year.

Whenever we of the minority criticize the top-heavy Budgets of the present administration we are asked in a tone that indicates that the question itself should silence all opposition: "Where would you make the cuts?"

Speaking for myself alone, I would suggest that the bill we are now considering offers a good place to start. In making that statement I am supporting the Democratic platform—the platform on which the Democrats rode into power in 1932, but which they have consistently and completely ignored since they were elected.

We have heard much of late about the "good neighbor" policy. It has been publicized in such a way as to leave the impression that it is something new and unique. How does the naval policy of the administration square with its "good neighbor" professions? Does a good neighbor prove his neighborliness by buying more guns and laying in larger stocks of ammunition to be used against one or more of the neighbors?

The Nye committee has disclosed how munitions manufacturers have in the past helped involve us in war. By providing more business for these same "merchants of death" we are giving them proof of our willingness to be cooperative and encouraging them to continue the propaganda by which nations that want to be neighborly, and even friendly, are induced to fly at each other's throats.

I would suggest that the party in power, at its forthcoming convention at Philadelphia, write this plank into its platform:

We promise, in spite of the badly unbalanced condition of the national Budget and a national debt approaching \$40,000,000,000, in spite of increasing unemployment and lengthening relief rolls, to continue to expand the military and naval Budgets without regard to cost. We promise to give munitions manufacturers funds appropriated for bread for the poor. We promise to encourage by our enthusiastic participation that race of death which leads toward another great war, toward universal bankruptcy, toward the eclipse of liberty, and the final destruction of civilization.

Be honest, write that plank into your platform, and then await the verdict of the people! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota, to support his accusation of partisanship, read the plank of the Democratic platform of 1932 relating to national defense. It is my purpose now to turn back that challenge as is right fit to the Republican Party. He did not tell what the leaders of the Republican administration did to this country in the way of bankrupting it and piling up debt, making shortages in personal income and corporate income and national income.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. Pardon me, I have not the time.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I supposed we were discussing—

Mr. BIERMANN. I have not yielded to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I will if I have time after reading this plank of the platform. The gentleman wants me to read the Republican platform plank on armament. It is not a concise plank like the Democratic plank is, but it is one that includes everything. It is for reduction of armament and for increase of armament, for arbitration and against arbitration, for internationalism and for nationalism. I read now from the Republican platform:

Reduction of armament: Conscious that the limitation of armament will contribute to security against war, and that the financial burdens of military preparation have been shamefully increased throughout the world, the administration under President Hoover has made steady efforts and marked progress in the direction of proportional reduction of arms by agreement with other nations. Upon his initiative a treaty between the chief naval powers at London in 1930, following the path marked by the Washington conference of 1922, established a limitation of all types of fighting ships on a proportionate basis as between the three great naval powers. For the first time, a general limitation of a most costly branch of armament was successfully accomplished.

In the Geneva Disarmament Conference now in progress America is an active participant, and a representative delegation of our citizens is laboring for further progress in a cause to which this country has been an earnest contributor. This policy will be pursued.

Meanwhile the maintenance of our Navy on the basis of parity with any nation is a fundamental policy to which the Republican Party is committed. While in the interest of necessary Government retrenchment, humanity, and relief of the taxpayer we shall continue to exert our full influence upon the nations of the world in the cause of reduction of arms, we do not propose to reduce our Navy defenses below that of any other nation.

National defense: Armaments are relative and therefore flexible and subject to change as necessity demands. We believe that in time of war every material resource in the Nation should bear its proportionate share of the burdens occasioned by the public need and that it is a duty of government to perfect plans in time of peace whereby this objective may be attained in war. We support the essential principles of the National Defense Act as amended in 1920 by the Air Corps Act of 1926 and believe that the Army of the United States has through successive reductions accomplished in the last 12 years reached the irreducible minimum consistent with the self-reliance, self-respect, and security of this country.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield if the gentleman will tell me in a few words what that means.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. The gentleman calls upon me to make a half hour's speech, for I presume it would require that much time to discuss fully everything contained in that plank; I shall not do that, but merely call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under Republican administrations an honest effort was made to get the nations together to reduce armaments. Furthermore, under the last Republican administration the appropriations for the Army and Navy were several hundred million dollars lower than they have been under this administration. The gentleman will also concede that under this administration those appropriations have increased progressively so that we have now passed by over \$100,000,000 the \$1,000,000,000 goal which the Democratic platform said we were approaching and which the Democrats in 1932 viewed with so much alarm.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIERMANN. No one has been more opposed to the appropriations of the last several years than I have, and I am going to vote against this bill.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Good.

Mr. BIERMANN. I have not voted for an Army appropriation bill or for a Navy appropriation bill since I have been in Congress. I do not expect to vote for any until they are reduced below what they have been; but the gentleman certainly should not indict the Democratic Party for failure to try to make international arrangements to maintain peace, because a Democratic administration was the originator of that type of thing, and a Republican Senate, for nothing but the basest kind of partisan motives, defeated that effort.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am not going to get into an argument with the gentleman from Iowa with reference to the League of Nations, but I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa the reason this budget is so much is due to the failure of the Republican Party in the Hoover administration to carry out the platform which the gentleman from Iowa has just read. It is now incumbent upon the Democrats to afford the country the national defense which the gentleman's party failed to afford when they were in power.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. I should like to make the observation that as far as the Republicans are concerned they built a Navy, as they did in the Harding administration, then sank it and came back to build it all over again; so what are they talking about?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just spoken stated that he has not voted for a national defense bill since he has been in Congress.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, let me correct that. I do not want to haggle about a national defense bill or have it hung on something I voted against. I am as much for national defense as any Member of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I cannot yield further because the gentleman is taking too much of my time. Possibly I misquoted him, although I understood him that way. He probably said that he had never voted for a Navy bill.

Mr. BIERMANN. Or an Army bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Or an Army bill. There may be a distinction between a national defense bill and an Army bill and a Navy bill, but if there is, I do not quite understand it.

Mr. Chairman, unlike the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN], I have never voted against a national defense bill since

I have been a Member of Congress. However, I feel constrained to vote against the pending bill.

I am going to vote against this bill for several reasons.

First, I believe the Congress, the direct representatives of the people, should determine if, when, and how the national defense, which, of course, contemplates the Army and the Navy, should be increased or decreased. The matter of discretion is involved, and the power to make these momentous decisions should not be delegated to the Executive or any bureau of the Government. Our Army and Navy are most efficient, and we must rely much upon them. At the same time the policy should be determined by the Congress. Naval men become navy-minded just the same as bureaucrats believe in expanding bureaus.

During the depression Congress has appropriated large sums of money for relief. And the executive branch has been given authority to determine where this money should be expended. Without any initial authority from the Congress the Executive, through the N. R. A. and the P. W. A., entered upon naval projects, and now in this bill the Congress is asked to appropriate money to complete these projects, which were never authorized before the initial work was done and millions of dollars expended. Under the guise of emergency legislation no branch of our Government should be permitted to initiate public expenditures that must be carried on for years.

This same policy has been pursued by the Executive in reference to various reclamation, irrigation, and other projects, like Passamaquoddy Bay and the Florida canal. In short, we have reached the time when the people are demanding that the Congress take a hand in the matter of determining where the money is to be spent.

Second, I am very much opposed to the building of any additional capital warships or dreadnaughts at this time. I understand fully that the building of such ships is not made mandatory by this bill. However, again the President is given a certain discretion whereby upon the happening of certain events, in his judgment, he might commence the construction of two of these superdreadnaughts at a cost of approximately \$103,000,000. That is the estimate, and we all know that the final cost will be much more. If this bill passes with this last provision, then it is pretty safe to say that before another year rolls around the work will have been inaugurated, possibly the keels will have been laid, and then, like the Florida ship canal, we will be asked to complete the work to save the money we have already invested, if for no other purpose.

I am not unmindful of the provision in the bill indicating that the Executive should not commence the construction of these two battleships unless signatory powers to the Limitations Treaty indicate their purpose to construct like ships.

In view of conditions in Europe today, is there any doubt in anybody's mind that work would not be commenced on these ships before next year's appropriation bill? The Congress will be in session in January next, and by that time we will definitely know as to whether or not we must build additional battleships if we are to keep pace with the other signatories. Then, again, inventions are being made so rapidly that it is altogether possible that we will not want superdreadnaughts in our scheme of things by the time these ships would be completed and available. I cannot see a single reason why this \$103,000,000 and more should be authorized or appropriated at this time.

I yield to no one so far as my belief in adequate national defense is concerned. What is adequate defense? I have received several letters within the last week asking me that very question. We all know that the matter is controversial. Even our Military Establishments cannot agree as to the proportion of equipment. Some believe in large ships; others in destroyers; many in the air forces—so, after all, it is difficult to state just what constitutes adequate national defense. Our people want such defense, but they want no more at this time. In these days we should be thinking about curtailing expenses and balancing the Budget; which, of course, means taking some of the burden off the backs

of the taxpayers. Every dollar unnecessarily spent for battleships takes just that much money out of the pockets of the average man and woman in the country, and to that extent deprives those taxpayers of benefits which they would otherwise enjoy.

Let us not forget that while our people are ready to support proper defense, yet those same people are not war minded. They want no more war. They do not want to exalt our Army and Navy beyond necessity. I am sure that all patriotic citizens want us to make sufficient appropriations to protect our citizens and our land. They want our flag at all times to demand the respect of all nations, and our people will be satisfied with nothing less.

In closing let me insist that it is our duty to eliminate all unnecessary items from this bill, reduce expenditures to the minimum in keeping with national security.

This bill carries approximately \$555,000,000, which is a number of millions of dollars more than appropriated last year. It seems to me that there should be a reduction instead of an increase. The committee cites the fact that the committee has reduced the amount below the amount asked for by the President in his Budget. For this the committee is to be commended, but experimental drydocks at a cost of \$10,000,000 each will entail endless upkeep and expense in the future. This is not warranted by necessity and this construction is not justified. As I stated in the beginning, I shall with regret vote against my first Army or Navy bill during my service in Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman is clearly laboring under a misapprehension, because in the act of March 27, 1934, the Congress authorized the construction of two battleships and the replacement of further battleships as they reached their limit in accordance with the terms and provisions of the Washington-London Conference. It is not necessary to have any further hearings or any further authorization, because it is a part of a plan already authorized.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather amusing to listen to the remarks made by my distinguished friend from Minnesota, a former Governor of that great State [Mr. CHRISTIANSON], when he undertakes to claim credit for the Republican Party during the years from 1921 to 1933 in maintaining a proper national defense for our country.

I recognize that our political feeling sometimes prompts us to interpret things in a way most favorable to our own position. The fact remains, and the truth is, that the Washington Conference was held during the Harding administration, as a result of which we scrapped several hundred million dollars of naval vessels which were then under construction, and many of which were practically completed.

Mr. Chairman, coming forward to the present time, we find during the Republican administrations from 1921-33 a failure to engage in necessary building; a failure to make replacements; that the Navy was permitted and directed to use naval vessels that had gone beyond their normal life. In March 1933 our Navy, for all practical purposes, was hardly stronger than the French Navy, having in mind the defense of Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Great Britain had a navy stronger than ours. Japan had a navy stronger than ours,

not only in vessels but in tonnage. Furthermore, both nations had made replacements with new, modern, up-to-date vessels.

This occurred during the 12 years of Republican administration. As the gentleman from Minnesota has injected this matter into the debate, I rise to show how negligent the past Republican administrations have been with reference to our national defense. Since the inauguration of President Roosevelt a different policy has existed. Our Navy has been strengthened, as it should have been before. President Roosevelt is giving our people a Navy for defense, and not for offense, that will assure protection of our people and our shores.

Now, my other Republican friend who spoke, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], talked about adequate national defense. What is adequate national defense? If I addressed that question to an audience of 1,000 persons, each one might well ask, "Just what do you mean?"

An adequate national defense, in my opinion, is the building up of our Navy to the limits allowed by our treaties with other nations. Such is not a general statement but is a specific statement as to what I consider as constituting adequate national defense. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL RESEARCH LABORATORY

For laboratory and research work and other necessary work of the Naval Research Laboratory for the benefit of the naval service, including operation and maintenance of a laboratory, additions to equipment necessary properly to carry on work in hand, maintenance of buildings and grounds, temporary employment of such scientific and technical civilian assistants as may become necessary, and subscriptions to technical periodicals, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, \$300,000: *Provided*, That \$50,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the temporary employment of civilian scientists and technicians required on special problems: *Provided further*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$120,000, in addition to the amount authorized by the preceding proviso.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt not to use the entire 5 minutes, but I do want to make an observation with respect to what was said about scrapping \$176,000,000 worth of ships during the Harding administration.

This may look like a sheer waste of energy and money and yet the strict fact is that we scrapped seven super-dreadnaughts and four cruisers in 1922 for very specific purposes. The first specific purpose, as I conceive it, was that we assumed a position of moral leadership in the world for the purpose of bringing other nations into line so far as disarmament was concerned. The second reason was that Japan, Great Britain, and the United States were sitting around the table for the purpose of approving a treaty that bore the celebrated 5-5-3 ratio.

What was the condition at the time this conference was being held? Japan was holding out and continually insisting that she should have the right to build just as many ships as she liked and she did not care to subscribe to a 5-5-3 limitation. What could she do when the United States of America assumed leadership and said, "We will point the way, we will seek to make as impressive a contribution toward disarmament as we possibly can, and we are willing here and now to assume the responsibility of discontinuing and destroying \$176,000,000 worth of naval handiwork that embrace the money of the taxpayers of the country?"

Under these circumstances there was nothing for that rising oriental power to do except to follow the United States, and I want to make it clear to this committee that while we may talk about scrapping \$176,000,000 worth of ships involving the taxpayers' money and that it may look like a blot upon the escutcheon of the Harding administration, the fact is it was an excellent investment. The United

States, for once at least in its history, assumed to give direction to the thinking of the world, assumed to take a position of leadership in the hope that the other nations would follow suit.

Mr. LUNDEEN and Mr. VINSON of Georgia rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me first finish my statement.

Unfortunately, however, they did not follow suit. It was a very painful but worth while lesson, so far as the United States was concerned, and on the basis of what happened in 1922 we can feel reasonably safe in going along with the naval appropriation bill until such time as we eliminate suspicion and jealousy and commercial rivalry, which are the basis of all wars.

It is a grand, magnificent bit of futility to stand here and oppose a reasonable naval appropriation bill, thinking that armament and naval appropriations are the incentive for war. This is a lot of balderdash and poppycock. Nobody would say, for instance, that a police force of 1,600 men here in Washington is an incentive to crime. Nobody would contend with any degree of logic or reason that battleships and cruisers and destroyers are any incentive to get into war. There are other reasons for war, and we have been going along seeking to oppose appropriation bills for military and naval defense thinking we are making a contribution to peace when we are doing nothing of the kind.

Sometimes I think that in proportion, as we lay an aggravated burden upon the pocketbook of the Nation, we make the Nation conscious of our purpose. Strike the average citizen in his pocketbook and ultimately he will come to the conclusion that something ought to be done about it. All these years since the Civil War we have been going along supinely and indifferently thinking so little about a philosophy of peace or the development of peace consciousness. When this can be effected in all the nations of the world, that will be when we may stop pyramiding large armament in the Orient, in the United States, in Great Britain, and elsewhere. We simply have not got at the cause. We are confusing cause and effect, and let nobody hesitate about voting for adequate defense, or even for this naval appropriation bill, with the exception of possibly one or two items, thinking that by so doing he is saving his gracious position in behalf of those who are in favor of peace.

I yield to no one in this body so far as a desire for universal peace is concerned, but we must get at the real root of the matter. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 4, strike out "\$300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment I do not in any way desire to increase the total appropriation under this bill; but I do desire to question the advisability of providing only \$300,000 for scientific research work in a game of this kind.

The appropriation calls for an expenditure of a little more than a half a billion dollars. As I study the question of naval armament, we know that other countries are spending tens of millions of dollars in research, and that it is a game which requires the greatest attention to this particular phase of the work that can possibly be given.

If we hope to develop the latest scientific improvements, if we hope to be equal to foreign nations who have spent millions in such work and are spending millions in such work every year, we should make it possible for the Navy Department to develop a naval research laboratory equal to any in the world in order that we may keep pace with other nations in scientific research, so that we shall advance far beyond anything heretofore developed by our Nation in the matter of national defense, which includes communications, explosives, and other items. We must not fail in this.

While the public does not know of the important procedure other countries are pursuing in connection with scientific research work, there are men in this country who do know what is going on.

In my opinion as a layman and private citizen, this \$300,000 is not at all sufficient for research to accompany an expenditure involving more than half a billion dollars.

I know that if we went out to spend \$100,000,000 in any private field of achievement you would provide three or four hundred thousand dollars for scientific research work. I would like to ask the acting chairman if there are any provisions anywhere else in the bill which gives us more money for scientific research work than is provided in this item?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I shall undertake to answer the question in my time if the gentleman will permit me to do so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the development of the airplane and the dirigible is fast breaking down ocean barriers which have afforded us a natural protection. We now must be prepared to seek protection by science so that we can develop defensive and offensive means of protecting our fleet from modern mechanical warfare. The first step in this line of defense and offense lies in the development of suitable equipment, which must receive its initial development in our highly developed naval research laboratory. The naval research laboratory must become one of the strongest arms of our national defense, and I should like to inject this at this time in connection with what was said a moment ago. Had the doctrine and philosophy of Secretary Stimson been followed out, I should like to ask if Japan would have dared make the announcement which she handed to our Secretary of State on December 29, 1934, which, in my opinion, led to the cancelation of the Nine Power Treaty, and which today brings us under a set of circumstances wherein the United States, Great Britain, and France are traveling this road alone, with Italy and Japan out on the side. And it brings us down to this very bill where we have to say in the most unusual terms:

Not more than two capital ships, as replacements of over-age capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that capital-ship-replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament signed at London, April 22, 1930, \$115,300,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment; and in answer to a question propounded by the gentleman proposing the amendment, I advise him that at the present time the Navy has an experimental laboratory at Annapolis, it has one at the navy yard in New York, and also it is carrying on experimental work through the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at Langley Field. The real reason that this amendment should not be agreed to is that the gentleman is evidently confusing the research work of the entire Navy Department with the research laboratory at Belvue. The research laboratory at Belvue deals only with radio and sound investigations. It is not the general laboratory of the Navy Department. The subcommittee went to that station at Belvue last year and made a careful survey. We increased that appropriation to meet their needs; and in my judgment, Mr. Chairman, this station to which the gentleman proposes to give an additional \$700,000 could not use it during the coming fiscal year. There is no purpose in making an additional allotment of \$700,000 to just one part of the Navy research work throughout this country. I hope, therefore, that the Committee will vote down this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only point I desire to make here—

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yielded to the gentleman for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am going to ask a question. The only point I desire to make clear is this. I want to know if this \$300,000 which is provided in the bill is the total amount which is being appropriated for scientific work in connection with the naval operations of this country, and if it is not,

what other appropriations are being provided in this bill or in other bills?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, the gentleman was talking to someone when I made the statement a moment ago which covered the inquiry. I shall be very glad to repeat it, however. This is not the only appropriation carried in the naval appropriation bill for experimental work. The Navy now has experimental laboratories at Annapolis, at the navy yard in New York, and experiments are being carried on by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics at Langley Field, Va., and at other places, and in practically all departments of naval activity. The Bureau of Standards, of course, is a Government agency that serves all Government departments, including the Navy. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman's amendment reaches only one small branch of the naval experimental activities, located at Belvue, which does nothing but deal with radio and sound investigations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Where in this bill or any other bill are these things provided for?

Mr. UMSTEAD. They are provided for in the appropriations for the various units under the department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 5, line 5, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$160,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL PRISON FARMS AND PRISON PERSONNEL

For the operation, maintenance, and improvement of naval prison farms and for the welfare, recreation, and education of prison personnel, to be expended under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, \$14,270: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall not exceed the aggregate receipts covered into the Treasury in accordance with section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my enforced attendance on another committee prevented me from accepting the allotment of time kindly made to me by the subcommittee chairman on general debate, as it had been my desire to occupy a little time on this bill in that way.

When one has held fixed views on matters of great national concern over a long period of time, under widely varying stresses and circumstances, he naturally attaches more or less weight to such views, and it is his duty to impart them to his fellows for whatever they may be worth at the risk of whatever criticism there may be to himself.

Over a long period of time I have accumulated some observations, perhaps cynical observations, regarding questions of international relationships, of peace treaties, neutrality laws, and preparedness. I do not have the time now to go into my views on this question, but I shall avail myself of the liberty of extending them in my remarks in the RECORD.

Briefly, it is my fixed conviction, based on a long life of observation, that international friendship is a diplomatic myth and that peace treaties and neutrality laws are only as strong as the will and the power to defend them, and just as weak.

There is another reason, perhaps personal and sentimental, why I should like to have availed myself of some time in general debate. In brief, it is this: Twenty-four years ago this month on a naval appropriation bill, as a young man, I stood back in that aisle and participated in the debate.

Some of you know that there is a hiatus of just exactly 20 years in my congressional record. It is a rather interesting thing, after a lapse of 24 years, to dig back into the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see what your views were then. I have done that, and it is a matter of some assurance and satisfaction for me to know that I may stand here today and read my remarks from that long-gone debate of 24 years ago to state my position on this naval appropriation bill. I was then, as I am now, a big-navy Democrat. I was then, as I am now, for a full measure of preparedness in every line of national defense.

They say that history repeats itself. Yesterday on this floor in the debate I heard the same question asked that I heard in that long-gone debate: "For what are you preparing?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I do not move fast enough. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. They asked, "What war do you want to prepare for?" Gentlemen asked that question 24 years ago. Gentlemen said on this floor, "Why do you want to build up a navy; there will never be another war." The man who afterward became minority leader on that side of the aisle, a very able man who served in this body for 26 years, said this country would not need to build another battleship or any other kind of warship for 25 years.

When was that? That was in May 1912. In that body there then the living survivors of two wars in this country, the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. Behind them there was a history of 5,000 years of war and almost nothing but war among the human race on earth, and yet they stood here and argued that we needed no navy because there would never be another war. I asked the gentleman from Iowa yesterday about the question asked of Gen. Leonard Wood in Boston when he was making a preparedness speech in 1916. A heckler wanted to know for what war General Wood wanted to prepare. I pointed out that that question was asked in 1916, and that in 1 year history had answered it by the precipitation of this country into the greatest war in human history. In my judgment, the thing is to be prepared. If you ask me what is adequate national defense, I would say, "It is defense measured by the power and responsibility of the Nation." When you want a navy you want it now. You want it at once. You do not have any time to build navies. You do not have any time to prepare after war breaks.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CASTELLOW. Might we not just as well ask a man when he buys a lock to put on the door, "For what thief are you guarding against?"

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. There is just as much sense to it.

I beg your indulgence to read a few lines from my remarks made 24 years ago. I quote from the RECORD of May 28, 1912, at page 7338:

One day during this session our socialistic brother, the gentleman from Milwaukee [Mr. Berger]—

And, by the way, he was a lovable man and a very popular Member of this body—

made what I thought was a very pat and apt suggestion, and that was that neutrality is a good thing if only you are able to enforce it.

Mr. Chairman, I subscribe most heartily to that proposition. I was one of the thirty-odd Members on this side of the House who voted for two battleships in each of the two naval appropriation bills in the Sixty-first Congress, and I regret very much that the pending naval appropriation bill does not make similar provision. [Applause.]

The applause I quote from the RECORD. The occasion of the applause was that the Democratic majority at that time had held a caucus in this Chamber to pledge its membership against the construction of even one battleship in that session of Congress, in which only thirty-odd of us opposed the resolution. Continuing my quotation:

While I represent the State which above all others in the Union is secure from foreign attack or invasion, I take some pride in the

fact that I am as much in favor of an adequate Navy as any Member of this body who represents a seaboard district.

Quoting further along from my remarks on that occasion, I said:

I confess, perhaps it is because I am so dense, that I can no more distinguish between a defensive and an aggressive navy than I can between good trusts and bad trusts.

That was an issue in those days, good trusts and bad trusts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The following is from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 28, 1912, pages 7338-7339.

According to my way of reasoning, a navy is either adequate or inadequate, measured by the power and responsibility of the nation. I can conceive of no other practicable test. This is one case where, in my judgment, a half loaf is not better than no bread. A weak navy would provoke, not prevent, trouble. Either we should have and maintain a first-class navy or none. It takes 2 years to build a modern fighting ship and so long to build a modern navy that you must keep building. When you want a navy, you want it badly and at once. One naval battle decided the war between China and Japan. One naval battle decided the war between Russia and Japan. Two naval battles decided the war between the United States and Spain. In these four engagements, three navies were destroyed and their countries humbled and driven from power for decades; and unless the human race has suddenly lost its instinct of the ages, other powers will meet the same fate.

Members of this House participated in the greatest Civil War in all history. Since then the world has witnessed the terrible Franco-Prussian war, the war between Turkey and Greece, the war between England and the Transvaal, the war between China and Japan, the war between Japan and Russia, the war between the United States and Spain, of which we also have survivors in this House; so that, within the memories of yet vigorous and active men, every great nation of the world—England, the United States, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, Turkey, China, Japan, all of them—have been involved in war. Shall we see no more terrible wars? To ask this question in the light of history and the racial instinct is to answer it.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. The answer, much as I deplore it, will probably be the same answer that was given to the question asked of Gen. Leonard Wood as Boston in 1916.

I am for preparedness and I am for the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I want to expand briefly on those instrumentalities of peace on which some gentlemen appear to rely rather than on preparedness measures. I indicated them at the outset of my remarks.

I read recently an expression of regret by the representative here in Washington of a foreign power over statements made by a distinguished and authoritative Member of the other body, which statements this representative considered as in violation of the "traditional friendship", as he expressed it, between our two countries. The only fear I would have of pretenses of friendship from such a source would be that they might tend to lull our people into a false sense of security and encourage defenselessness.

How lacking in substance is international friendship is most strikingly shown by the fact that within 20 years after the Revolutionary War, France and the United States were in a state of incipient war over treaty differences, with American warships engaged in French waters, and again in 1866, when the United States compelled the withdrawal of France from Mexico. I mention these historical facts in no spirit of reproach to France. I believe if lasting friendship between nations were possible, it would be possible between the United States and France.

The United States fed Belgium during the Great War and paid for the dirt to rebuild it after the war, yet Belgium promptly repudiated her financial debt to this country. That was her requital of the finest display of generosity ever shown by one nation to another. Belgium, which owed us everything, has paid nothing; while Finland, which owed us nothing except the money she borrowed, has paid everything. Belgium also joined the little gold bloc which frustrated the efforts of this country at the London Economic Conference to stabilize international currencies and exchanges.

The United States by a virtual tour de force set up the Republic of Panama, transformed it from a region of death-laden swamps and jungles into one of the most healthful spots on the continent, and built across it the greatest engineering project in history, giving it a permanent and important place on the map of the world, yet Panama was the only nation that went into court and brought suit against the United States to exact payment of our canal leasehold obligations in gold at the predevaluation price. Her attitude toward us has always been one of truculence. It is a question if there is not a more friendly attitude toward this country in the Republic of Colombia, from which we virtually wrested Panama, and to whom at the last session of Congress we authorized the payment of \$25,000,000 in liquidation of the alleged damage.

Even our "little brown brothers", who could not repay in centuries what we have done for them, a record of generosity and abnegation without precedent or parallel, are demanding payment in gold at the predevaluation price of a deposit of \$23,000,000 in the United States Treasury, which deposit it is now claimed was in silver and certainly not in gold.

I do not mention these cases as singling out for disparagement the Panamanians or the Filipinos; I merely mention them as exhibits in making out my case against international friendship. There are doubtless others, or there would be others under like provocation. If friendship between nations has any place in the preservation of international peace, it is entirely too fragile a restraint to withstand any serious strain.

Nor is the writing of treaties any assurance of international peace. The treaty to protect the neutrality of Belgium and preserve it from invasion was a scrap of paper. The first military move of Germany, a party to the treaty, was to trample that helpless and inoffensive little power into the dust. Now Germany has not only completely scrapped the World War peace treaty, which she signed under duress, but also the Locarno Pact, to guarantee European frontiers against militarization, which she voluntarily signed long after the war.

The Nine Power Pact is a scrap of paper. That pact guaranteed the political sovereignty and territorial integrity of China, yet for 4 years now, Province by Province, China is being dismembered and taken over by a signatory to the pact.

The United States has 33 peace treaties, negotiated under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, slumbering in the archives of the State Department. They are forgotten.

The Member of the other body to whom I referred a moment ago called attention to the fact that while peace societies and movements pursue the procuring of these peace agreements with evangelistic zeal, yet when the agreements are flouted, when they are violated by the very signatories, nothing is done about it, nothing is said about it.

What is said of treaties of peace may be said of neutrality laws. I voted for the neutrality resolution in the last session of Congress and the amended resolution in this session. I would have voted for the original bill still further extending embargoes to materials which may be used for military purposes. But I would vote for such measures rather as a gesture in the direction of peace than as any insurance of peace. Germany found ways and means to involve this country in war, presuming that this country was powerless to retaliate, and ways and means may be found to involve it in future wars. Neutrality laws, like peace treaties, must depend for sanction upon the power behind them.

Mr. Chairman, the Monroe Doctrine is said to have preserved the Western Hemisphere inviolate from foreign conquest, but there is only one nation in the Western Hemisphere which could have promulgated and enforced the Monroe Doctrine. Even without the Monroe Doctrine, the certainty that any invading power would have to face this great Nation would be the restraining influence, and if it were not for this power the map of South America today would be like the map of Africa, a Joseph's coat of many colors to indicate the colonial possessions of a half dozen European powers.

A differentiation is being made between wars of invasion of American territory and wars not involving such invasion. May I ask the question, Within which category would fall the protection from foreign invasion of any nation on the American Continent? Supposing a foreign power were to invade

Central or South America. This was more than a supposition at the time of the outbreak of the World War. Then a great European power envisioned just such an enterprise. Perhaps the contempt of Europe or of the world for the ability of the United States to defend itself is not now so great. If not, that is one of the benefits to be set up against the terrible cost to us of that war.

I favored adherence to the League of Nations and the World Court. The chief objection to the League of Nations is that its covenants provide sanctions. The trouble with sanctions is that they call for enforcement, which involves military measures. That is the trouble with all peace pacts and treaties. It is also the trouble with neutrality laws. They are not self-executing. Their violation calls for redress, and the circle is complete. The end of the circle is war.

The modus operandi of the League of Nations is that the aggressor nation shall be determined and all the sanctions of the League, one after another, invoked against it jointly by all the other members, the final sanction being military force. In the case of Manchuria, the aggressor nation was determined and condemned. There the procedure stopped. It is agreed that in the case of Manchuria the League of Nations failed. It is failing in Africa. Nothing short of the complete procedure of the League of Nations can stop war, and the world is not ready for any such procedure. If we want neutrality, we must be prepared to defend our neutrality. If we want peace, we must be prepared to defend our peace.

If I may write the defense laws of the country, I care not who writes its neutrality laws or its peace treaties. My formula for the national defense is simple. It is to be so ready that the other party will hesitate to start.

The term "adequate national defense" is not self-defining, but standards of comparison are available. It would embrace, if not what Woodrow Wilson called "incomparably the greatest navy in the world", at least a navy equal to the strongest, and an air force of equal rank. It would embrace the framework of a land force capable of prompt and great expansion. And what is equally important, it would embrace research and experimentation in every instrumentality entering into warfare. We should keep thoroughly abreast in point of knowledge as far as ascertainable with what other nations are doing and our own laboratories should be busy.

I abhor war and all its evils. I regard its coming, not with anticipation but with dread. But I cannot go along with the view that the way to avoid war is to stick your head in the sand and expose your rear elevation to the horizon. There are six great powers in the world besides the United States. Two of them are now at war, one in Asia and the other in Africa. A third has flung its gauntlet in the face of Europe. England has just voted one and a half billions for defense. For this country to neglect or slight its national defenses in the face of such a world would be living in a fool's paradise. The wisest counsel ever given this country was by a great progressive President, the first Roosevelt, who said: "Speak softly and carry a big stick; you will go far."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of my distinguished friend from Colorado, particularly that part in which he referred to statements he made upon this floor 24 years ago. It appears that even then Members of Congress and people generally throughout the country were speaking of an "adequate" or "inadequate" navy. Even then the expression "adequate navy" was paramount in the minds of those discussing the question of national defense; but apparently—and with all deference to my good friend the gentleman from Colorado, for whom I have such a high regard—it seems that even 24 years ago people were omitting to define

what they meant by "adequate." In other words, they said "adequate", but they did not say adequate for what. It seems to me this question cannot be properly discussed unless we decide first of all for what purpose we want an adequate navy. Do we want a navy adequate to protect us from invasion, or do we want a navy adequate to enable us to carry on a war of aggression? I submit that if we are to have a navy adequate for the purpose of carrying on a war of aggression, then this bill is perfectly justified; then I do not believe we are appropriating too much money. But if we are to content ourselves with a navy adequate to protect us against invasion, adequate for the purpose of protecting ourselves against any probable enemy, then we are spending far too much money today on a navy.

In my humble judgment a large navy today under conditions of modern warfare can be used successfully for only one purpose—that of aggression, of foreign war. Today, when we speak of national defense, there is no place in the picture for a large navy. Admiral Bristol in 1932 made the statement that a navy would not be used for the purpose of protecting our harbors or our coast lines; that we would have land fortifications, mines, submarines, and the Air Corps for this purpose. Secretary of the Navy Swanson recently stated that a large navy was needed primarily for the purpose of protecting our foreign trade and foreign policy. I submit that the question of national defense does not include the protection of our foreign trade [applause]; and if we are going to consider this proposition solely from the standpoint of national defense, if we are going to listen to the demands of the American people who are against our preparations for a foreign war, we will kick this bill out of the window; we will recommit it to the Committee on Appropriations and have the committee bring back a bill that will eliminate from the Navy all such activities and agencies as are designed and are primarily useful only for foreign and aggressive war. We are going crazy in this country on the subject of building a huge navy, something that under no possible circumstances can give us any real defense. True, it might make us more powerful; it might throw the fear of our Navy into the hearts of some small countries; but a large navy is not needed for the purpose of protecting our people, protecting our own country.

We are spending a lot of money for a huge navy that can be used only for aggressive or foreign warfare, and doing this at a time when millions of our people are crying for bread. In my judgment it is ridiculous; in my judgment it is a waste of money to pass this huge appropriation. In my judgment we ought to reorganize the Army and Navy into one department of national defense, for defense only, and forget about building a navy second to none. We do not need a large navy in this country to protect our own people and our own property. In my judgment a large navy is merely a threat to the peace of the world. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Newport, R. I., \$125,000.

Mr. RISK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RISK: Page 7, line 18, after the words "Rhode Island", strike out "\$125,000" and insert "\$198,000."

Mr. RISK. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment to increase the appropriation for the naval training station at Newport, R. I., by \$73,000 is to rehabilitate in some measure the physical condition of the buildings at that training station. The training station at Newport was established as a permanent station in 1883, and since that time has been administered efficiently and has done remarkable work. With the exception of 2 years, from 1933 to 1935, it has been open. It was closed completely from July 15, 1933, to July 15, 1935, at which time it was reopened. For 3 years there have been no appropriations for repairs. It is obvious to anyone that after being closed continuously for 2 solid years, deterioration must have set in to a great extent in those buildings.

Mr. Chairman, at this station there are over 100 buildings, 50 of which are permanent brick buildings. When the station reopened in July of last year I saw with my own eyes

the state of repair of those buildings. I went over every inch of ground and I was in every one of the buildings. I saw not only the enlisted personnel, but some of the trainees, actually engaged in cleaning up debris and patching up the walls and roofs of those buildings.

The committee proposes, and the proposal is included in this bill, to include for alteration and repairs the sum of \$7,700. This amount is ridiculously low. Anyone knows that \$7,700 is too small an amount to take care of necessary repairs and alterations of buildings which are valued by the Navy Department at four and three-quarters million dollars, but which we feel are worth between ten and twelve million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for the thousand trainees there, for the 212 men who make up the enlisted personnel at the station, and for the civilian employees who have been precluded from employment by reason of the fact there has been no appropriation made to take care of this station. The sailors have been forced to do the work themselves and the civilian tradesmen and skilled mechanics have been excluded by virtue of this situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to make just a very brief statement.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill carries an increase of \$10,000 over the appropriation made for this station last year. The Budget estimate was \$135,000, but due largely to savings we hope may be effected in the purchase of oil we reduced the amount by \$10,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe we have provided for all essential needs, and I therefore trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. RISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. RISK. Was not certain information given to the subcommittee in connection with an item of \$66,000 which was asked to cover repairs and alterations for the training-station buildings at Newport, R. I.?

Mr. UMSTEAD. As I recall, there was no such estimate, and I am informed by the clerk of the committee that no such estimate was received by the committee.

Mr. RISK. Did the gentleman or the subcommittee receive any correspondence from the citizens of Newport and myself on this point?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I did not receive it.

Mr. RISK. Mr. Chairman, I may say there is considerable correspondence in the files of the subcommittee on this point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RISK) there were—yeas 24, noes 43.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Norfolk, Va., \$235,000, of which sum \$10,000 shall be available immediately.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLDEN: On page 7, between lines 21 and 22, insert:

"Naval athletic and training field, San Pedro, Calif., acquisition by the Secretary of the Navy, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, at a cost not to exceed \$225,000, the premises known as the Navy Athletic Field, San Pedro, Calif., and adjacent lots now occupied as a Navy athletic field. Upon acquisition such property shall be maintained as a naval athletic and training field, to be known as the Mississippi Memorial Athletic Field, in memory of the 48 officers and sailors who lost their lives in the U. S. S. Mississippi disaster in 1924."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to remind the Members of Congress of a very unhappy day, June 12, 1924, when one of the greatest peacetime tragedies occurred in the

United States Navy by an explosion that occurred on the battleship *Mississippi* during practice maneuvers off the shores of San Pedro, Calif. The Pacific Fleet was engaged in maneuvers and practice firing when an explosion caused the instantaneous death of 48 men, officers and seamen. The crew in a turret of the *Mississippi* had touched off an electric firing signal, which failed to explode. The crew was confined in the turret, during which time gas was generated in the gun and then ignited. In addition to the 48 men killed, a number were injured.

The naval funeral services of these 48 officers and men were conducted on the athletic field of the Pacific Fleet at San Pedro, Calif., provided by the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce. These men who lost their lives in this great tragedy came from many States of the Union. It was not only a tragedy for the Navy but it brought sorrow and tears to a number of patriotic American homes. It was one of the most unhappy tragedies that has occurred in peacetime history of the American Navy.

The *Mississippi* was known as the "happy ship" and the commander was Capt. W. D. Brougherton. The *Mississippi* was proud of its 14 star athletes and held the Navy athletic championship for 4 years. Many were the victories and many were the athletic battles fought on the famous Navy athletic field at San Pedro.

It is to be regretted that the dependents of these naval officers and men have been meagerly provided for by the United States Government. The families that sustained loss and who have suffered bereavement because of this catastrophe are scattered throughout the Nation. The obligation due the dependents of these officers and men has been limited because of the general laws prescribing the benefits allowed to the dependents.

Mr. Chairman, it seems most fitting that the rich and generous and patriotic Government of the United States should take some steps at least to preserve the memory of these heroes who died in their country's service. Those who die on the battlefield or in a naval combat are warned of the dangers that confront them. They have an opportunity to fortify themselves against the dangers which they must face. When they are in such an engagement they recognize the impending doom of death. Not so with the noble and courageous men who lost their lives in the turret of the *Mississippi*. They entertained the idea that theirs was a harmless exercise. When the day's work was done they looked forward to a return to the base at San Pedro and were happy in the anticipation of the events of tomorrow. Without a second of warning a mysterious flash and their lives were snuffed out. Trapped by walls of steel, with no hope of escape, their lives and their destinies were ended instantly. And these officers and men gave their lives in the service of their country as patriotically and as nobly as those who die in the heat and terror of battle.

Mr. Chairman, it seems most appropriate that a memorial should be dedicated to the memory of these heroes who met an untimely death while at the post of duty. It also appears that the athletic field where the final obsequies of these departed heroes were held would be a most fitting site for memorial purposes. It was upon this field that the men of the *Mississippi* had won some of their most brilliant athletic victories. It was upon this field that for a period of 15 years the men of the Pacific Fleet have enjoyed many happy recreational hours. It was upon this Navy athletic field that many athletic contests have been won and lost. It is a field that has attracted the attendance not only of the major naval officials, but also of thousands of the civil population. It is a field that is deeply steeped in the athletic traditions of the United States Navy, the arena of the living, the funeral course of the dead.

This athletic field has been furnished by the San Pedro Chamber of Commerce for 15 years without cost to the Navy. The San Pedro Chamber of Commerce has not only paid the rent of this land, but upon numerous occasions has made other contributions to aid and to provide proper facilities.

Unfortunately, the owners of this land now propose to subdivide and offer it for sale. The tract consists of about

23 acres. It is located about 90 feet above the water front and adjacent to the tidewater of Los Angeles Harbor. It is the most accessible point for the major part of the Pacific Fleet. It is but a few minutes away from the battleships within Los Angeles Harbor. There is no other tract so available, so well drained, so accessible to transportation as is this athletic field.

A number of the officials of the Pacific Fleet, including several admirals, who are fully acquainted with the situation, have heartily endorsed the purchase of this area for a permanent Navy athletic field. The purchase of this field would serve a double purpose. It would be a most suitable and fitting memorial for the death of the officers and men who lost their lives on June 12, 1924, but it would serve as a permanent arena for future athletic activities. It would provide a valuable contribution to the welfare and happiness of the men of our fleet.

The Pacific Fleet is based at Los Angeles Harbor—right at the door of San Pedro, Calif. Because of the easy access to open waters, because of the continual sunshine and absence of fog, the unusual visibility makes this location the natural headquarters for the Pacific Fleet. Furthermore, the geographical location, being the nearest suitable base in California to the Panama Canal, and an advantageous point relative to the Hawaiian Islands and to the northerly shores of California, Oregon, and Washington, make this the logical base for the Pacific Fleet. Already keen observers and those who are concerned about national defense believe that the construction of a Navy base at San Pedro is inevitable. The purchase of this athletic field, which I have designated as "the Mississippi Memorial Athletic Field", is timely and opportune. This purchase should be made before this land is subdivided and sold. I am informed it will cost approximately \$225,000 if purchased as a unit. If subdivided into lots, it would bring a much larger amount.

I introduced a bill on July 8, 1935, designated as H. R. 8761, which provides for the establishment of the Mississippi Memorial Athletic Field as before described. I desire to not only interest the Members of Congress but to enlist their aid in the establishment of this fitting memorial athletic field in memory of the 48 officers and men of the invincible United States Navy whose tragic death shocked the entire country on that fatal day, June 12, 1924.

The following is a list of the names of the officers and enlisted men, United States Navy, who lost their lives in the explosion aboard the U. S. S. *Mississippi* on June 12, 1924, together with names and addresses of nearest relatives, furnished by the Bureau of Navigation, Navy Department:

OFFICERS

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Thomas Edward Zellars, United States Navy. Next of kin, wife, Mrs. Mary Ann Zellars, 127 Grand Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.

Ensign Marcus Erwin, Jr., United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Marcus Erwin, 101 Furman Avenue, Asheville, N. C.

Ensign William George McCrea, United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Charles R. McCrea, 705 Ontario Avenue, Renova, Pa.

ENLISTED MEN

Anderson, Rodney Laverne, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Elva Wooley Davey; address, 1143 Sanborne Avenue, Hollywood, Los Angeles, Calif.

Barbee, Norman Lee, coxswain, United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Ella E. Barbee; address, 111 Noe Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Berg, Joseph, engineman (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Katie Berg; address, Mount Vernon, Wash.

Beto, Stephen, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, brother, Mr. John J. Beto; address, 113 Orland Street, Bridgeport, Conn.

Bourgeois, Clarence Thomas, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Louis S. Bourgeois; address, Waveland, Miss.

Bridges, Homer Sylvester, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, father, Mr. Robert H. Bridges; address, Braxton, Miss.

Brumfield, Vernon, coxswain, United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Cora Brumfield; address, Norfield, Miss.

Byers, George Allen, boatswain's mate (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Rose Byers; address, 1340 Mastick Street, San Jose, Calif.

Caldwell, Carl Covington, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, sister, Miss Archie Caldwell; address Route No. 1, box 48, Dover, Ark.

Christensen, Paul Holten, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Sarah G. Kluesner; address, 854 Twelfth Street, San Diego, Calif.

Clarke, Philip Cunningham, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, father, Mr. Henry Clarke; address 909 South St. Andrew's Place, Los Angeles, Calif.

Cook, William George, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, sister, Mrs. Elinor Struckhoff; address, 1417 Breman Avenue, St. Louis, Mo.

Darazio, Albert, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Ana Darazio; address, 332 Boston Avenue, Egg Harbor City, N. J.

Ewer, Fred Graham, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Percy S. Ewer; address R. F. D. No. 3, Birmingham, Mich.

Flynn, Peter Ambrose, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Mary Flynn; address, 174 Salem Street, Northboro, Mass.

Green, Paul, chief yeoman, United States Navy. Next of kin, father, Mr. Henry Green; address, 1619 West Nineteenth Street, Little Rock, Ark.

Holliday, James Durward, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, father, Mr. James W. Holliday; address, Mena, Ark.

Hopkins, Farris Carlton, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Minnie Hopkins; address, Adairsville, Ga.

Huffman, Edward Homer, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Ora Denny Huffman; address, R. F. D. No. 4, Aurora, Ind.

Kerr, Cedric, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy. Next of kin, mother, Mrs. Nettie Kerr; address, 1424 South Eleven-and-a-Half Street, Terre Haute, Ind.

Keys, Wallace Walton, coxswain, United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Gertrude S. Davis, Madera, Calif.; also survived by father, Mr. Joseph P. Keys, 720 Geary Street, Fresno, Calif.

Kiely, Bartholomew David, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Johanna Kiely; address, 739 High Street, Holyoke, Mass.

Kimball, Floyd Burritt, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. Louis F. Kimball; address, 1416 Twelfth Street, Greeley, Colo.

King, Frank Brandenburg, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Sarah Dale King; address, 614 East Green Street, Clinton, Mo.

Kinney, Andrew Reuben, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Mary Kinney; address, Argonia, Kans.

Klonowski, Frank Leo, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Marie Truschke; address, 487 Broadway Street, Blue Island, Ill.

Lawson, Albert Leonard, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, brother, Mr. Louis T. Lawson; address, 1641 Bristol Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Lubo, William Francisco, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, uncle, Mr. Santos Lubo; address, Cahuilla, Calif.

Magill, George Eugene, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Maud Magill; address, 714 South Sixth Street, Waco, Tex.

McCormick, John Albert, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Mary G. McCormick; address, 4271 West Two Hundred and Twentieth Street, Fairview Village, Rocky River, Ohio.

Malone, Leslie, gunner's mate (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, uncle, Mr. Fredrick W. Bachmann; address, 3028 Bellefontaine Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.

Ragan, Ted Carlyle, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Ida Alice Ragan; address, 1115 Sargent Street, Joplin, Mo.

Raymond, Floyd Allen, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. Milo W. Raymond; address, Floyd, Iowa.

Sharkey, John Divine, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Mary Sharkey; address 2629 North Bouvier Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Shaw, Doyle Nelson, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Linnie M. Bellamy; address, Clayton, Tex.

Sullivan, Claude Newton, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Louella Sullivan; address, Sargent, Nebr.

Skrynas, Stanley Joseph, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. Peter Skrynas; address, 26 Cherry Street, Easthampton, Mass.

Sloan, Andrew Jarvis, fireman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. James Peter Sloan; address, 3227 Calhoun Street, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Smith, Bradford Walter, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. Ephraim E. Smith; address, 216 West King Street, Martinsburg, W. Va.

Smith, Brigham Foster, gunner's mate (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Kate Smith; address, 4150 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Walkup, Howard Alexander, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Birdie Walkup; address, Crawley, W. Va.

Ward, William Howard, quartermaster (3d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, brother, Mr. Harrison Ward; address, 906 Fifth Avenue, Dodge City, Kans.

Willis, Lawrence Henry, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, father, Mr. Charles Willis; address, Osgood, Ind.

Woods, John Lewis, seaman (2d cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, sister, Mrs. Abbie Woods Fulton; address, 3070 Girard Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Zacharias, Frederick William, seaman (1st cl.), United States Navy; next of kin, mother, Mrs. Mary Zacharias; address, 5171 Kincaid Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the names of the 48 officers and men who lost their lives in this accident, together with their rank, next of kin, and address.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COLDEN] that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that the project mentioned in the amendment is not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. COLDEN. No. I recognize the point of order. I just desired to get this information before the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment on its face contains language which is legislation in contravention of the rule which provides that legislation shall not be in order on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, the point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Instruction: For postgraduate instruction of officers in other than civil government and literature, and for special instruction, education, and individual training of officers and enlisted men at home and abroad, including maintenance of students abroad, except aviation training and submarine training otherwise appropriated for, \$187,000: *Provided*, That no part of this or any other appropriation contained in this act shall be available for or on account of any expense incident to giving special educational courses or postgraduate instruction to officers with view to qualifying them or better qualifying them for the performance of duties required to be performed by or in pursuance of law by officers of the Supply Corps, Construction Corps, or Corps of Civil Engineers, except present students and except such officers who are commissioned in such corps or who have not been commissioned in the line of the Navy more than 3 years prior to the commencement of such educational courses or postgraduate instruction.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Page 8, line 24, strike out "three" and insert "five."

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to correct what I believe to be a mistake and an injustice. The language I seek to correct provides that no graduate of the Naval Academy shall be eligible for admission to any of the postgraduate schools of the Navy which are maintained by the Supply Corps, the Construction Corps, and the Corps of Civil Engineers unless his course of postgraduate instruction shall actually commence within 3 years of the date of his commission.

A year ago there was similar language in the naval appropriation bill. A number of young men in the Naval Academy class of 1932 had been designated to attend these postgraduate schools. When Congress passed an appropriation act with a provision similar to this the orders to these young men had to be rescinded because the date of their commission was in June of 1932, when they graduated from the academy, while the course of instruction in the postgraduate schools did not begin until September. Therefore their orders were countermanded and these men were returned to duty and the door of opportunity in the direction of their ambitions has been permanently closed to these young men.

I do not believe it was the intention of Congress to do this and I offer the amendment to make them eligible. My amendment does not enlarge the appropriation in any way. It simply enlarges the eligible list to include the young men of the class of 1932 who were designated to postgraduate schools a year ago and were denied the opportunity of entering those schools by a provision similar to this.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call to the attention of the members of the Committee the fact that the

amendment offered by the gentleman involves the same question which was fought out during the consideration of the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. The 3-year limitation which now appears in this bill was placed in the appropriation bill last year.

I think most members of the Committee will recall the debate at that time between the distinguished chairman of the legislative committee and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY]. The House decided last year it would stand by the recommendation of the subcommittee on appropriations and inserted this provision in the bill.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, this is very important. I should like very much to be able to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman, but I cannot do so and I urge the Committee to vote it down.

Before this provision was put in the bill the Navy Department could wait for 10, 12, or more years after a man had been graduated from the Naval Academy, send him to a special training school, then give him some position in keeping with the special training which he had had or take him out of the specialization for which he had been equipped and send him back into the line. Your committee felt this was not a proper procedure. The Navy itself was somewhat divided on it, but it is our present information that the Navy is now convinced that this provision is sound and from now on they will apply it as strictly as they can, and as we have requested them to do in the legislation passed by the Congress. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Gladly.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I fully agree with the soundness of the position taken by the gentleman and by the committee. I do not wish to remove the limitation and make people who are 15 or 20 years out of the Naval Academy eligible for these schools. I fully agree they should be young men, and I simply wish to correct an injustice which was done to a small group of men last year who were denied entrance to the schools through what I believe was a mistake and make them eligible.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any further, but I desire to ask if the purpose of the amendment is not really to provide for one man.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. No; there are half a dozen, I understand.

Mr. UMSTEAD. The gentleman would not be willing to change the policy of the Navy in this regard just to take care of or correct an inconvenience to six men?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. This provision would only be in effect 1 year. It is a temporary provision and would have to be reenacted each year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK of New York) there were—ayes 19, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS, ACT OF MARCH 4, 1911

To reimburse the State of California, \$25,000; the State of Massachusetts, \$25,000; the State of New York, \$25,000; and the State of Pennsylvania, \$25,000, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in such States as provided in the act authorizing the establishment of marine schools, etc., approved March 4, 1911 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 1121), and for the maintenance and repair of the particular vessels loaned by the United States to the said States on the date of the approval of this act for use in connection with such State marine schools, \$90,000, and no other vessels shall be furnished by or through the Navy Department; in all, \$190,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that our State nautical schools have set up qualifications for entry in such a manner that candidates for school-ship training from any State other than that in which the school ship is located are compelled to pay a higher tuition on account of their out-of-State residence.

I see no reason why such tuition penalties should be applied against any American boy who seeks to train himself for a career at sea.

Mr. UMSTEAD. That policy is determined by the State in which the school is located.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I cannot see any reason why a young man from Colorado, say, should be discriminated against if he desires to enter a California school to which the Federal Government is contributing \$25,000. If Federal funds are to be appropriated for such nautical school ships, whether it be all or any part of the expense involved, then let us reestablish these schools as Federal merchant marine academies, with equal tuition for all regardless of what States of the Union any applicant may come from, and, instead of continuing under the present policy of appropriating Federal funds for a State nautical school, that these schools be reestablished as Federal merchant marine academies, so that there shall be one each, as follows: One on the Atlantic coast, one on the Gulf coast, one on the Pacific coast, and one on the Great Lakes.

Furthermore, instead of requiring the applicant to pay a tuition fee for attending such merchant marine academies. I recommend that the Federal Government assume all cost of education in such merchant marine academy. Many of our best potential merchant-marine officers who constitute our Naval Reserve officers are unable to enjoy the benefits of higher training for the merchant marine under our present system of maintaining State nautical-school ships due to the heavy financial obligations involved. Our merchant marine officers must be trained in their profession in the same manner that we train our Navy, Army, and Coast Guard officers. Give them all a thorough education before they are given officers' responsibilities, and in this manner help cut down the great loss of life at sea.

Landlocked States are discriminated against. Such States have no water outlet and boys from these States are barred from participating in low tuition rates. This is unfair.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the legislative act which provides for this activity. It was passed in 1911. These are not Government schools. Any State can take advantage of this offer, and if it does it will be supplied by the Government up to \$25,000 toward meeting the expense, and also with a ship for the purpose of instruction. Thereafter the State can put up any amount it pleases. They are not schools of the Federal Government.

The Federal Government will match State funds only to the extent of \$25,000 per year. If the gentleman's State of Michigan wants to secure aid from the Federal Government, it has the right to do so under provisions of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. Without objection, the pro-forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

ORDNANCE AND ORDNANCE STORES, BUREAU OF ORDNANCE

For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material, for the armament of ships; for the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances; for the purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work under the cognizance of the Bureau of Ordnance; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for technical books; plant appliances as now defined by the "Navy Classification of Accounts"; for machinery and machine tools; for accident prevention; for experimental work in connection with the development of ordnance material for the Navy; for maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; not to exceed \$15,000 for minor improvements to buildings, grounds, and appurtenances of a character which can be performed by regular station labor; for payment of part time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia, or elsewhere, of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled freight and passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only

for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations; for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots, and for care and operation of schools at ordnance stations at Indianhead, Md.; Dahlgren, Va.; and South Charleston, W. Va., \$21,700,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,300,000.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] has pretty well stated the issue involved in this bill as I look at it. I think everyone agrees that we ought to have national defense, but the question involved in the vote on this bill is whether or not this bill is for national defense. If we assume that we are going to be involved in a war on foreign shores, this appropriation is proper, probably it ought to be increased, but I take it that the Members of this House and the American people pretty generally want this Republic in the future to confine her war activities to the North American Continent, and if we confine our war activities to our home shores, this amount of money is too much. I asked in the beginning of this debate, and I have asked a number of times since, that somebody bring into this House a statement by any Army officer or Navy officer of any kind of plan under which the United States could be successfully invaded, and no one has offered that plan, and no one will, because it cannot be done, and the Army and the Navy people agree that it cannot be done. I asked also that some proponent of this bill name a single time in a hundred years when a beligerent from the water had successfully made a landing on a defended hostile shore. Of course, nobody can bring in such a statement, because such a thing has not happened. The idea of building \$51,000,000 battleships to defend our shores is just ridiculous. It does not make sense at all, and nobody can successfully defend that sort of thing on the ground of defense. Of course, the upshot of it is that if we vote this kind of appropriation we are going to take from the taxpayers' pockets money they can ill afford to pay at this time and add to the international irritation that is the excuse for this appeal for armament. A year or so ago when we passed the stupendous authorization for shipbuilding, the newspapers within a week or two contained the information that in Japan our action had been used as an excuse for voting more appropriations in Japan, and now if Japan or some other foreign country increases her appropriations, it is an excuse for us to increase ours, and so the thing piles up. This country can afford to set an example.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes.

Mr. COLDEN. Did I understand the gentleman from Iowa to state that he is not in favor of building these new battleships to protect the coasts of our country? I call attention to the fact that in southern California we have numerous oil-storage tanks, that our cities are dependent on an aqueduct 240 miles long, that we have Boulder Dam about the same distance from the city that supplies the cities and farms, and that a foreign war vessel could send airplanes over and wipe out the whole business within a few hours if we did not have battleships to forestall them and thwart them.

Mr. BIERMANN. That is a novel theory; but I think you would have a hard time getting any naval officer to say it is practicable for Japan to send a navy 5,000 miles from Yokohama to San Francisco and successfully attack the people in California.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not also true that Japan does not have auxiliary ships with which to support a capital ship moving from Japan to the United States?

Mr. BIERMANN. I cannot say for certain as to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman will find that they are absolutely completely nonsupplied with such auxiliary ships.

Mr. BLAND. But does not the merchant marine furnish adequate support as an auxiliary?

Mr. BIERMANN. I have no information in regard to the Japanese merchant marine.

I direct the attention of the Committee to what could be done with this money that we propose to appropriate for the Navy. There is before this House a bill to continue 3½-percent interest on the Federal land-bank mortgages for a term of 2 years, and the obstacle it has run against is the statement by the Farm Credit Administration that it would cost the Government \$10,000,000 a year to do that. That may be the reason why we do not get 3½-percent interest on Federal land-bank loans in the next 2 years. With all the money appropriated in this bill we could give that relief to the farmers, not for 2 years but for 53 years. For the year 1935 the total tariff receipts collected by our Government amounted to \$343,000,000. This bill appropriates for the Navy alone nearly \$190,000,000 more than all our tariff receipts for last year. All the public buildings in Washington could be replaced—and some of them are said to have been extravagantly built—for half the money that it is proposed to vote for the Navy this year.

Out in Iowa we try to have hospitals in the county seats. We have one in my town. I do not think it cost \$100,000, but suppose it cost so much and suppose we had an endowment of \$50,000 for it; we could do the same thing for 3,000 counties in the United States for \$450,000,000. We could build a paved highway 18 feet wide, such as we have in Iowa, at a cost of \$25,000 a mile the entire 3,173 miles from New York to San Francisco, which would cost \$79,325,000, and we would have left, after building and endowing 3,000 hospitals and after building the paved highway from New York to San Francisco, enough money to refund all the property taxes paid in four average Iowa counties, out of this one appropriation of \$532,000,000 that we propose to vote for the Navy.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin has said that we have gone crazy on these preparedness appropriations. It is an easy matter to appeal in the name of patriotism and preparedness and ring the changes on the best sentiments in the hearts of the members of this Committee, but it will not wash out in the cold light of reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee one question.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I do not have the floor. I have the floor solely for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

PAY, SUBSISTENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Pay of naval personnel: For pay and allowances prescribed by law of officers on sea duty and other duty, and officers on waiting orders, pay—\$34,212,380, including not to exceed \$1,698,034 for increased pay for making aerial flights, no part of which shall be available for increased pay for making aerial flights by more than three officers above the rank of captain and below the rank of vice admiral nor by nonflying officers or observers at a rate in excess of \$1,440 per annum, which shall be the legal maximum rate as to

such nonflying officers or observers; rental allowance, \$7,271,430; subsistence allowance, \$4,285,103; in all, \$45,768,913; officers on the retired list, \$8,297,701; for hire of quarters for officers serving with troops where there are no public quarters belonging to the Government, and where there are not sufficient quarters possessed by the United States to accommodate them, and hire of quarters for officers and enlisted men on sea duty at such times as they may be deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which may render them uninhabitable, \$3,000; pay of enlisted men on the retired list, \$6,891,254; interest on deposits by men, \$3,000; pay of petty officers (not to exceed an average of 7,720 chief petty officers, of which number those with a permanent appointment as chief petty officer shall not exceed an average of 6,744), seamen, landsmen, and apprentice seamen, including men in the engineer's force and men detailed for duty with the Bureau of Fisheries, enlisted men, men in trade schools, pay of enlisted men of the Hospital Corps, extra pay for men for diving, and cash prizes (not to exceed \$100,000) for men for excellence in gunnery, target practice, communication, and engineering competitions, \$82,293,763; outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment, civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct or undesirability or inaptitude, reimbursement in kind of clothing to persons in the Navy for losses in cases of marine or aircraft disasters or in the operation of water- or air-borne craft, and the authorized issue of clothing and equipment to the members of the Nurse Corps, \$1,801,426; pay of enlisted men undergoing sentence of court martial, \$64,400, and as many machinists as the President may from time to time deem necessary to appoint; pay and allowances of the Nurse Corps, including assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors—pay, \$550,120; rental allowance, \$23,040; subsistence allowance, \$21,900; pay retired list, \$215,710; in all, \$810,770; rent of quarters for members of the Nurse Corps; pay and allowances of transferred and assigned men of the Fleet Naval Reserve, \$13,790,890; reimbursement for losses of property as provided in the act approved October 6, 1917 (U. S. C., title 34, secs. 981, 982), as amended by the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 34, sec. 983), \$10,000; payment of 6 months' death gratuity, \$150,000; in all, \$159,885,117; and no part of such sum shall be available to pay active-duty pay and allowances to officers in excess of nine on the retired list, except retired officers temporarily ordered to active duty as members of retiring and selection boards as authorized by law: *Provided*, That, except for the public quarters occupied by the Chief of Office of Naval Operations, the Superintendent of the Naval Academy, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps and messes temporarily set up on shore for officers attached to seagoing vessels, to aviation units based on seagoing vessel including officers' messes at the fleet air bases, and to landing forces and expeditions, and in addition not to exceed 40 in number at such places as shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy, no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Naval Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLeod: On page 24, line 17, strike out "\$82,293,763" and insert in lieu thereof "\$72,293,763, and for like purposes, in addition, the \$10,000,000 appropriated in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, under Bureau of Yards and Docks, Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, for 'floating drydock, type B, including mooring facilities and accessories', such sum being hereby reappropriated."

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment at this time basing the need for the amendment on economy and using as authority former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Roosevelt, and several other witnesses' testimony relative to the building of the proposed floating, movable drydock.

It has been contended that there has never been contemplated a floating drydock of this size, or even ever proposed up to this time by any nation of the world. There are some small floating drydocks, but this proposed experimental work is large enough to house the largest of the battleships, according to the testimony we have. The Navy Department did not come to the Appropriations Committee on Naval Affairs for the proposed \$10,000,000; they got it from the deficiency committee.

I want to state some of the facts at this time and some of the information that our subcommittee had relative to this vast experiment. This proposed drydock is 1,016 feet long. It is 165 feet wide. It is 75 feet from top to keel. The only

way in this bill we can stop construction is to reappropriate the \$10,000,000. Mr. Chairman, \$10,000,000 will not build this drydock. The testimony before our committee was that it would require another \$5,000,000 or thereabouts.

Second. This floating drydock will have to be towed back to the United States every 3 or 4 years for renovation and repairs. According to the testimony received by our committee, it will take several vessels to tow this so-called floating drydock across the ocean. The testimony given before our committee stated that a concrete-constructed or permanent graving dock is more substantial and more lasting than steel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLEOD. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Does not the gentleman, as a member of the committee, believe it would be much better and more economical to build a graving dock on the shore of southern California, which is the nearest point not only to Honolulu but to the Panama Canal, the most vulnerable spot in defense on the Pacific coast?

Mr. McLEOD. Unquestionably it would at least be more economical.

Now, I should like to read to the Committee some of the important questions that were asked of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy and his answers. I appreciate that this bill was approved by the legislative committee of the House.

I quote from the hearings:

Mr. CARY. * * * I was wondering if this amount of money that you contemplate spending on it in the future, in view of the fact that it is in the nature of an experiment, could not be used to better advantage in some other way in connection with naval activities.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. To be perfectly frank, I questioned that same thing myself.

A little further down this colloquy occurs:

Mr. McLEOD. Does any nation of the world have a similar drydock?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I think so—floating docks. England, France, Germany, and I believe Italy have floating docks. They are common in those countries. I think England has a battleship floating drydock at Singapore, but these are all of the old type, more or less like the *Dewey*. No nation, so far as I know, except the United States, has a dock of this new type.

Mr. McLEOD. Admiral, it is really contemplated only to use this floating drydock at Honolulu, is it not?

Admiral TAUSIG. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, if that is the case, then this drydock is to be used only at Pearl Harbor, Honolulu. The cost of a permanent drydock is \$4,000,000, compared with approximately \$15,000,000 for this experiment. The argument in favor of the so-called floating drydock, of course, is that it could be moved from place to place within certain areas in case of emergency.

A few moments ago the gentleman from California asked if it would not be preferable to build a graving dock on the west coast. Certainly it is feasible; it is equally feasible to build a permanent drydock at Pearl Harbor and save perhaps \$10,000,000 required for a floating drydock. Up to the present time no plans have been completed for the construction of this floating drydock, there has been little expense on the part of the Navy so far for this proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will carry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it quite clear to the members of this Committee that there is no item carried in the bill for the construction or maintenance of the drydock. It should be well understood that this item has not been investigated as such by our committee. The testimony from which the gentleman from Michigan just quoted certain questions and answers was given to our committee in response to an

inquiry on the part of the chairman with reference to some facts about the matter. There was no detailed presentation of the matter before the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I frankly say to the members of this committee that I cannot stand here this afternoon and tell you whether this drydock ought to be constructed or not, because the subcommittee of which I am a member has not heard sufficient evidence to determine that question.

What is the situation? A bill was passed by this Congress and sent to the President which authorized the construction of a drydock. Last year, subsequent to the passage of that legislation, the Navy Department, or the proponents of that measure, appeared before the subcommittee on deficiencies of the Appropriations Committee, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], chairman of the whole committee, is the chairman, and submitted to the subcommittee on deficiencies the evidence about this drydock. The subcommittee on deficiencies recommended it to the Congress and the Congress appropriated \$10,000,000. It now develops, Mr. Chairman, that this amount of money is not sufficient to complete this drydock, but the Navy Department did not appear before us asking for additional funds with which to construct it. I do not believe, in view of the discussion on this floor and the questions asked in our committee, that the Navy Department will undertake to proceed with the construction of this drydock until it presents the matter again before the legislative committee supported by sufficient evidence to show that the authorized cost is inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of orderly procedure, I submit that a committee that has not heard the evidence is not prepared on the evidence presented and from what we have heard to pass judgment on this project which the Navy considers important. It may or may not be that it ought to be constructed; I do not know. I think, in the name of orderly procedure, this amendment ought to be defeated, and then, if necessary, our committee can at the proper time hear sufficient testimony to enable us to act sensibly and intelligently in submitting a recommendation to the House with reference to this item.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Yes; gladly.

Mr. DITTER. Can the gentleman suggest what would be jeopardized by deferring this matter until the members of the subcommittee can investigate and inquire into it and bring a recommendation to the House?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I just said in my remarks, Mr. Chairman, that I was confident the Navy Department would not proceed in the absence of the presentation of further evidence as to the necessary increase in cost.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina has very clearly stated the correct situation with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD]. As a matter of fact, there is no item in the appropriation bill dealing with a drydock.

Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman seeks to take away from the appropriation bill \$10,000,000 and revert it back into the Treasury for the reason that last year the Congress appropriated \$10,000,000 to carry out an authorization. On April 15, 1935, the Congress passed an authorization bill, and one of the items was:

Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor, floating drydock, type B, including mooring mast and accessories, \$10,000,000.

What happened? Immediately thereafter the President of the United States wrote a letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and asked that \$10,000,000 be

appropriated to meet certain things for the Army and certain things for the Navy. One of those items for the Navy was \$10,000,000 for a drydock, to be a floating drydock, at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Chairman, what was the reason? This was due to the fact that the fleet is in the Pacific and there are on the Pacific coast only two places at which a battleship can be docked or at which an airplane carrier can be docked. The Navy only owns one place from Seattle to San Diego where a capital ship may be docked, and that is at the Bremerton Navy Yard. Think of it! With our fleet in the Pacific we have only one place that belongs to the Government in which a capital ship, if wounded in action, could be dry-docked. It is true that the Government leases and rents in San Francisco Bay a place known as the Hunters Dry Dock, which belongs to the Bethlehem Steel Co.

With 18 capital ships, with 2 airplane carriers, with an increase of 4 more airplane carriers, making approximately 22 capital ships, there is on the Pacific coast but one place belonging to the Government that a capital ship can be put in drydock. There is not a drydock large enough at Mare Island. The drydock at Mare Island, referred to in this bill, is for cruisers. Therefore it was of national importance and an urgent matter that the President should request Congress to make available \$10,000,000 for the construction of a drydock.

It is true the Government has never heretofore built a floating drydock of this character and size. We have a floating drydock at Manila that is somewhat smaller. Great Britain has a large floating dock not quite as large as this one will be. When it was ascertained that we were going to build a drydock the British Government sought to sell to the United States Government the old dilapidated drydock which they have.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down, because it is in the interest of national defense that this floating drydock be built.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is an acknowledgement on his part that we should take the action suggested by the pending amendment. The gentleman declared that the subcommittee had received no information on this matter. He acknowledged the fact he was not prepared, nor was any other member of the subcommittee prepared, to defend this item.

The gentleman from Georgia comes here and bases his plea entirely on the fact that the President requested this item. The gentleman from Georgia has made no statement with respect to the practicability of this floating drydock. He admits the fact that it is an experiment. He admits that he can produce nothing in the way of assurance to the House that this \$10,000,000 venture will prove successful. He admits, however, that in addition to the \$10,000,000 already requested and provided for through the deficiency bill, it will cost at least \$5,000,000 more.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the reasonable judgment of the Members of the House that if this were a matter of hazard, if this were a matter of urgency, if the gentleman from Georgia had stated that we were in a position of jeopardy by which a reasonable deferring of this item might create difficulty, we on this side might be persuaded to go along with him. But there is no need for the rush. There is certainly no need at the present time to go into this \$15,000,000 experiment and have on our hands the same thing that we have had in the case of a great many of the other experimental programs which have been carried on.

I want to say on behalf of the minority that we will join in supporting the measure if after due deliberation, if after careful examination and inquiry the proof is established that this drydock is feasible, that it is practical, that it will work, and when we know what the cost will be. There is not only involved the cost of the drydock but there is also involved the cost of the necessary dredging facilities that must of necessity be brought about in order for the drydock to be effective.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Democratic Members of the House to join with us in deferring for the time being the expenditure of this \$10,000,000 plus the additional \$5,000,000 which is required as a result of the authorization. Let us wait until next year, and if it is then proved that a drydock is worth while, that it is practicable, and that it will do what the gentleman says it will do, we will join with you. A graving dock can be provided at much less expense. We can go into Pearl Harbor and make extensive preparations there which will carry out the same ultimate objects as this floating drydock.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the membership of the House to support the worth-while amendment now pending before the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McLEOD) there were—ayes 22, noes 47.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, for pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel, \$183,492,981, of which sum \$1,000,000 shall be immediately available, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That additional commissioned, warranted, appointed, enlisted, and civilian personnel of the Medical Department of the Navy, required for the care of patients of the United States Veterans' Administration in naval hospitals, may be employed in addition to the numbers appropriated for in this act: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipmen whose admission subsequent to January 30, 1936, would result in exceeding at any time an allowance of four midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress; of one midshipman for Puerto Rico, a native of the island, appointed on nomination of the Governor, and of four midshipmen from Puerto Rico, appointed on nomination of the Resident Commissioner; and of four midshipmen from the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to repeal or modify in any way existing laws relative to the appointment of midshipmen at large, from the enlisted personnel of the naval service, from the Naval Reserve, from honor graduates of military schools or Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy for admission to the Naval Academy in the class entering in the calendar year 1937 who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission for at least 9 months prior to such admission.

Mr. DARROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of correcting what I believe to be a wrong impression created by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] a little while ago.

If I understood the gentleman's remarks correctly, he left the impression, at least upon me, that during the years intervening between 1921 and 1933 there was no naval construction started or authorized. Not wanting this impression to be left as a correct one, I would call the attention of the Committee to the facts as I understand them.

In 1924 Congress authorized the construction of eight cruisers of the large type, with 8-inch guns.

In 1929 Congress authorized the construction of nine cruisers of the same type, with 8-inch guns.

These have been practically completed during this period. It is true there were ten 6-inch cruisers authorized in the program of 1916, but most of them were built after the close of the war, and six additional ones were authorized in 1929.

There was one aircraft carrier, the *Langley*, authorized in 1929, which has been completed.

Eight submarines have been built during this period, and five of them, I believe, were authorized in 1923.

Eight destroyers have been built during this period of time.

While this may not have brought our Navy up to treaty strength, nevertheless it did show some increase in the strength of the Navy during this period.

I do not like to have the impression go out that nothing was done during these years to bring our Navy up to what I

consider to be proper treaty strength. I am in favor of a Navy of this type and want to do my part to bring this about and I do not want any wrong impression to go out to the country. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this naval appropriation bill, insofar as the amount of \$530,000,000 is concerned, is transcended by something which is even of far more importance.

It must be appreciated that there is no integrated defense policy in this country. The War Department through its officials, the Navy Department through its officers, and other departments through their various groups and bureaus attempt to settle the question insofar as they, themselves, are concerned, and all the time, as is evidenced in the debates to which I have listened here, the question uppermost with those Departments, and in the minds of most of those who have spoken here, is how can we beat the foreign nations with our program?

It seems to me before we go ahead with these tremendous expenditures—expenditures that, to my mind, are out of reason—we ought to have a national-defense program that is definite.

I remember conditions back in 1917 and 1918. I do not believe the people of America want to go to foreign lands any more than I do to engage in war. It is sufficient that we defend ourselves. It seems to me that an impartial body of men in this country could study and prepare a program that would be understood first by our own people, and by the nations of the world, and would have a tendency to cut down these continually increasing appropriations for destructive purposes.

I can see no country in the world today looking upon the United States with any intention of invading us. Only yesterday we passed a tax bill against which there was a great cry throughout the country. Every newspaper published our names because of the tremendous interest in it. We were taxing somebody, and here today we have a bill that takes back all of the money you taxed the people and appropriates it for one department of this Government. You are now adding another tax bill; yet I fail to hear the protests of the people, I fail to hear the protests of those who were against the tax bill yesterday. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro-forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy Yard, Mare Island, Calif.: For preparation of site, preliminary test pits, cofferdam, and other incidental preliminary work toward the construction of graving dock, services and auxiliary construction, \$150,000.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, after line 14, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Navy yard, including graving drydock for capital ships, auxiliaries, and accessories, San Pedro, Los Angeles Harbor, Calif., \$7,000,000."

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order and not authorized by law.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I will reserve it.

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to the Navy appropriation bill for the purpose of calling the attention of the Members of Congress to the need of dock and yard equipment for the capital ships of the Pacific Fleet. Because of the unusual facilities and the weather conditions the Pacific Fleet, with 15 capital ships, has its headquarters

in the San Pedro and Long Beach area. Natural causes dictate this to be the most satisfactory point on the Pacific coast for headquarters for maneuvers and for practice. Climatic conditions and superior visibility play an important part in these naval operations. This area is freer from fog, and Los Angeles Harbor affords much easier ingress and egress than any other port on the Pacific. In a few moments the entire fleet can come into the harbor and pass out into the open sea. Consequently, because of these facilities, the practice of gunfiring and maneuvering seeks this area as most favorable to the fleet.

There is but one navy yard equipped to repair and recondition the capital ships on the Pacific coast. This navy yard is located at Bremerton, in the State of Washington, on Puget Sound, and is 1,160 miles distant from the headquarters of the fleet. Each time a capital ship is sent from San Pedro to Bremerton it costs the Government \$8,800 for the round trip for a single item—fuel oil.

In his testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee Admiral Norman M. Smith, Chief of Civil Engineers of the Navy, and Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, emphasizes the needs of further docking facilities on the Pacific coast. Admiral Smith points out that because of the congestion at the dock in Bremerton the intersections of battleships cannot be thoroughly dried before the protective painting is proceeded with. Admiral Smith further points out that the private facilities at Hunters Point, San Francisco Bay, which have sometimes been used, are also unsatisfactory for naval requirements, due to the lack of proper equipment, the owners of the private dock failing to provide the facilities needed.

It is generally conceded that to keep the capital ships of the Pacific Fleet in an efficient condition further docking facilities are imperative. Inside the breakwater at San Pedro there is an area of land owned by the city of Los Angeles of more than 100 acres that is available for a site for a navy yard and a graving dock such as is required by the capital ships. I have reason to believe that if the Federal Government provided an appropriation for an efficient navy yard that the city of Los Angeles would contribute this site or perhaps any other selected by the Navy Department on city-owned land. Los Angeles owns a total of more than 2,500 acres of tidelands at the harbor. The tract already referred to inside the breakwater is but a short distance from 40 feet of water, and but a few hundred feet beyond there is a depth of 45, making this site easy of access by the minimum amount of dredging.

This site lies under the protecting guns of Fort MacArthur, located on an elevation of about 300 feet and less than one-half mile away. Outside of the harbor and 20 miles away is Catalina Island, which stretches for 35 miles, affording sites for forts and torpedo and mining stations that would furnish a strong line of outside protection. Other islands farther out in the Pacific could also be utilized for the protection of this port.

Southern California is peculiarly vulnerable to an attack from a foreign foe. The city of Los Angeles, with its 1,250,000 people, is supplied with water by an aqueduct 250 miles long. This aqueduct and its storage basins would invite foreign attack, and if destroyed, would bring immeasurable loss of life and property and suffering in its wake. Boulder Dam is another mark that would be sought by foreign foe. The destruction of this great reservoir would not only deprive farms and cities of southern California of a water supply but would bring wreck and ruin to the population and the farms below this dam.

In southern California, in the vicinity of Los Angeles Harbor and about the city itself, are numerous oil fields and oil storage. The destruction of these tanks and storage would loosen a flood of oil that would threaten a considerable portion of the city and the harbor with a disastrous deluge of oil and fire that would sweep everything before it to death and destruction. Los Angeles and the surrounding area are so susceptible of attack that it becomes one of the most important points for national defense to be found anywhere within the boundaries of our country.

I have mentioned that the headquarters of the Pacific fleet at San Pedro are 1,160 miles removed from the only available dock for the repair and reconditioning of capital ships on the Pacific coast. No fleet of the Navy, no warship or battleship of the Navy, can be kept in a state of efficiency without proper and available repair facilities. The navy yard is as essential to the ship as the garage and the mechanic to the continued operation of the automobile and the truck.

The Pacific Fleet located at San Pedro, as I have stated, is 1,160 miles from Bremerton, and it is even farther from the western terminus of the Panama Canal, which is 2,888 nautical miles to the southeast; consequently from the Panama Canal to Bremerton is 4,048 nautical miles, not statute miles. Undoubtedly the Panama Canal, as well as Los Angeles and the southern California area, would be points of attack by foreign invaders. If the Pacific Fleet were engaged in a battle to protect the Panama Canal, wisdom would dictate that a navy yard with facilities for repair and reconditioning should be located on the southern California coast. The Panama Canal situation emphasizes the need of these facilities at San Pedro. These facilities are needed in time of peace; they would be of great necessity in time of war.

Honolulu is the outpost of Pacific defense. Honolulu is located 4,685 nautical miles from Panama. Undoubtedly the easiest point of attack on the Pacific coast is the unprotected and practically defenseless condition of southern California and the Panama Canal. By the very nature of the Pacific coast, this area would invite attack. The long distance from the Panama Canal to Bremerton, 4,048 nautical miles, makes it quite evident of the grave necessity of a navy yard as far south as feasible on the California coast. San Pedro is 2,228 miles from Pearl Harbor at Honolulu; San Francisco 2,091 miles, and Bremerton about 2,400 miles. Consequently the location of San Pedro, about the same distance from Honolulu as other Pacific coast ports, and much nearer to the Panama Canal, gives it a strategic position not obtained by any other port of the Pacific coast.

Because of the lack of national defense on the Pacific coast, and the fact that southern California and the Panama Canal are the most vulnerable points in the Pacific area, I feel impelled to offer this amendment, and to call the attention of the House to the facilities that are vitally necessary for this Pacific coast line of national defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from North Carolina on the point of order.

Mr. UMSTEAD. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes a project for which there is no legislative authority.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the gentleman from California say as to that?

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment not from the standpoint of parliamentary technique, but from the standpoint of a proper defense of the Pacific coast and proper facilities for the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California concede that there is no legislative authority for the appropriation?

Mr. COLDEN. I recognize the point of order is well taken, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1936, \$700,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet air bases, fleet and all other aviation activities, accident prevention, testing laboratories, for overhauling of planes, and for the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, \$14,408,270, including \$221,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults and including not to exceed \$50,000 for the procurement of helium, which sum of \$50,000 shall be transferred to and made available to the Bureau of Mines on July 1, 1936, in addition to which sum the Bureau of Mines may use for helium-plant operation in the fiscal year 1937 the unexpended balance of funds transferred to it for such operation in the fiscal year 1936, and the Bureau may

lease, after competition, surplus metal cylinders acquired for use as helium containers; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, including the payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed, \$2,500,000; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories, \$20,980,000, of which amount not to exceed \$6,590,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization carried in the Navy Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1936; in all, \$38,588,270, and the money herein specifically appropriated for "Aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation for employees assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$1,582,340: *Provided further*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated, the Secretary of the Navy may, prior to July 1, 1937, enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$13,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer not to exceed in the aggregate \$24,000 from this appropriation to the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy" and "Pay, Marine Corps" to cover authorized traveling expenses of officers and enlisted men in connection with flying new airplanes from contractor's works to assigned station or ship, including travel to contractor's works and return of personnel to stations of duty, and the amount so transferred shall be in addition to any limitations contained in the appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy" and "Pay, Marine Corps": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coast of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes or for the construction or manufacture in a Government-owned factory or plant of airplane engines, other than experimental engines, or airplanes, other than airplanes for primary training purposes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$500.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$500." I rise at this point to say that the Portsmouth Navy Yard is situated in my district, and while for years it had nothing whatsoever to do with the manufacture and equipment of aircraft, it is, thank God, one of the leading yards in the country, designed and equipped for the manufacture of the finest and most modern type of submarines for use in the defense of the Nation, and further as a Member of this House who has the honor to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Military Affairs, I congratulate the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Congress on the spirit manifested in respect to the provisions in this bill under the title of "Bureau of Aeronautics." I know that every Member of this House who has studied this matter must realize that legislation of this kind is designed not only to consider the building of great battleships, aircraft, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines, but that its primary purpose is for national defense and national defense only. To secure adequate national defense we must build up an air corps which will be second to none in the world, because that is the one method by which we may be assured, and by which generations yet unborn may be assured, that in the future they will not be called upon to give up their lives because of attacks against us by any foreign nation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that our greatest danger now comes from the air, due to the fact that several other countries, at least three of them, have a greater air force than we have at the present time?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Yes, indeed. As a matter of fact, four of them have far greater air forces than we have; and in order to meet that situation, we must build up a larger air force both in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman seeks to convey the thought to the committee that other countries have a superior naval air force than we have, he is clearly in error.

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. I am not confining my remarks to the Navy. I am speaking of our combined air forces. I mean by that, airplanes designed to attack, whether in the Navy or the Army. I hope and pray that the Congress will see to it that the Army will soon be in a position where it need not be ashamed of the adequacy and efficiency of its air force.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman contend that an airplane can come across 3,500 miles of water and attack us?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. I contend, sir, that German seaplanes of existing types have alighted on the South Atlantic Ocean between Africa and South America to moor astern of a station ship—steamship *Westphalian*. This vessel is an ordinary merchant type, supplied with aviation fuel and other servicing facilities. Fuel and oil are transferred to the seaplane on the water. Meager reports mention experiments with a canvas ramp astern on which the seaplane may be hauled; also trials of canvas shelters for protection during refueling operations. The military significance of this commercial "mother ship" for seaplanes appears to have been ignored. As seaplanes become larger their ability to alight safely on the ocean increases. Acknowledging only the existing sizes of seaplanes, it is rather startling to contemplate that small inexpensive merchant ships are capable of serving as ocean supply bases for trans-oceanic bombing planes.

Mr. Igor Sikorsky, the eminent builder of large seaplanes, informed the Federal Aviation Commission, October 10, 1934, that seaplanes are now in course of design that can transport 10 tons for a nonstop flight of 2,000 miles. A single seaplane of that type—which is a prospect for the immediate future—then could drop 10 tons of bombs on any American coastal city simply by prearranging a rendezvous with a small servicing vessel at sea a thousand miles from the coast line.

These facts strongly emphasize that our Nation is no longer protected from air attacks because of the wide extent of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and we must govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman think that is a serious menace?

Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire. It is indeed a most serious danger, and a danger which must be met in the interest of national defense for the protection of our homes, our States, and our Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels, including the re-engining and completion of submarines 170 and 171 (39 Stat. 616), heretofore authorized and appropriated for in part under "Increase of the Navy, Construction and Machinery", including (1) the expenses in connection with continuing the construction of 2 aircraft carriers, 1 heavy cruiser, 3 light cruisers, 20 destroyers, 4 submarines, and 2 gunboats which were commenced in the fiscal year 1934 under funds made available from the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933, and (2) for the commencement of the following vessels authorized by the act approved March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503-505): (a) 12 destroyers and 6 submarines, and (b) not more than 2 capital ships as replacements of over-age capital ships, to be undertaken only in the event that capital-ship-replacement construction is commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the Treaty for the Limitation and Reduction of Naval Armament, signed at London, April 22, 1930, \$115,300,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of the amount available for expenditure under the head of "Construction and Machinery" for the fiscal year 1937 for employees in the field service assigned to group IV (b) and those performing similar services carried under native and alien schedules in the Schedule of Wages for Civil Employees in the Field Service of the Navy Department shall not exceed \$3,870,000: *Provided further*, That, of the appropriations made available by this act under the head of "Replacement of Naval Vessels" there shall be available such sums as the Secretary of the Navy may from time to time determine to be necessary for the engagement of technical services and the employment of personnel in the Navy Department and in the field, the purchase of plans, drafting and other supplies, and the expenses of printing and travel, in addition to those otherwise provided for, owing to the construction of vessels which have been or may hereafter be authorized.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order to the language contained after the word "submarines", in line 23, page 49, down to and including the figures "\$115,300,000", line 4, page 50. My point of order is based on the following: While there may be legislation authorizing an appropriation for capital ships, the language in the appropriation bill is not only a negative limitation but it also sets up a contingency. In other words, this language states that these capital ships are to be built only in the event of a certain happening. That in and of itself is legislation. The provision to the effect that this money may be spent only in the event that something happens constitutes a transfer of the power to build these ships, when to build them, and under what conditions over to the Executive. The transfer of such power is not found in the authorization, and consequently in this bill it is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Carolina care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. UMSTEAD. I do not, unless the Chair desires to hear from me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And may I say this in addition? It also requires additional duties upon the part of the Executive by the language:

Only in the event that capital ship replacements construction is commenced.

That requires additional duties on the part of the Executive and is clearly legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Vinson of Kentucky). The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that the language following the word "submarine", on line 23, page 49, down to the figures "1930" on line 4, page 50, includes legislation on an appropriation bill; and further submits that the limitation therein contained is not a proper limitation to be included in an appropriation bill.

If the Chair understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], he concedes the legislative authorization for the construction of the two battleships involved.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. My concession is only for the sake of argument. I said that if there was any authorization or any legislation authorizing the construction of these ships under the Vinson Act; but even on that point I say it is contrary to the treaty, which is the law of the land, and that these ships, according to that treaty, cannot be built until after December 31, 1936.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule. The Chair understood the gentleman from New York conceded the legislative authority.

The Chair will read from the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503):

The President of the United States is hereby authorized to replace, by vessels of modern design and construction, vessels in the Navy in the categories limited by the treaties signed at Washington, February 6, 1922, and at London, April 22, 1930, when their replacement is permitted by the said treaties.

Undoubtedly there is legislative authorization for the construction of the two capital ships involved.

In respect to the point of order to which the gentleman referred relative to the condition upon which the capital ships will be constructed, the Chair will read from chapter 227 of Cannon's Precedents, section 1579, which is directly in point:

The House may, by limitation on a general appropriation bill, provide that an appropriation shall be available contingent on a future event.

There are any number of precedents upholding the position of the present occupant of the chair, that where appropriations are made to be spent contingent upon the happening of some event or upon the performance of some condition, that they are in order.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: On page 49, line 23, after the word "submarines", strike out all the remainder of line

23, all of line 24, and lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 50 and insert "\$111,300,000."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment raises one of the most important issues found in this bill. My amendment reduces this appropriation by the sum of \$4,000,000. These \$4,000,000 are to be used for laying the keels or beginning the construction of two battleships. I submit to the Members of this Committee, first, that there is not a single iota of testimony in the hearings justifying the construction of these battleships. Second, we have not learned as yet who has asked, and on what ground the request has been made, for the construction of these battleships. No hearings at all were held on this point. I think it is most unusual, even if there are precedents for such procedure, to come before this House with an appropriation bill carrying such an important item of appropriation without a single word in the hearings and without a single iota of testimony to justify this particular item of appropriation.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In just a moment, when I have concluded my statement.

Furthermore, it is not only a question of the \$4,000,000 involved. Once these keels are laid, once these \$4,000,000 are spent, it means that we must complete the construction of the ships or we have thrown away the \$4,000,000. If we are to complete the construction of these ships, it means \$100,000,000. I know the argument may be advanced that perhaps some other country which was signatory to the naval treaty is about to construct its own ships.

I say, first of all, we have no direct evidence or no conclusive evidence to the effect that any signatory to that pact is at this time entering into a naval armament race. The whole world is looking at the United States. While this may seem insignificant to us sitting here, let us bear in mind that if we adopt this appropriation of \$4,000,000, and if we launch on the policy of building these two additional capital ships, it means that we are shooting off the pistol which will be a signal for a general world-wide armament race. We are telling the people of the world that we only talk peace but that we mean war. What justification is there for these two additional battleships? Promises have been made repeatedly that there would not be any additional battleships, and then on last Tuesday this committee goes on record for these two additional battleships, without a hearing, without testimony, and without justification. We are arming for an imperialistic war. That is what we are doing. We are arming to get into trouble. We are setting an example to the entire world. By appropriating money for two additional battleships we are giving the signal for a mighty armament race, the cost of which will be placed on the shoulders of the workers of this country and the workers of the entire world.

I appeal to every peace-loving citizen, to every advocate of national defense, why do you need these two ships for national defense? I challenge you to give us the answer. Furthermore, I challenge you to explain why there is not a single word in these hearings to justify these two battleships.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 15 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York stated that there was no hearing before the committee to justify this item in the bill. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is no particular discussion of the authorization of the 12 destroyers and 6 submarines referred to in the bill for the reason that Congress

debated that and passed a bill authorizing it on March 27, 1934. This committee is merely doing what Congress has authorized them to do—that is, to bring the Navy up to treaty strength.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BOILEAU. At the time we passed that bill was it not understood that we were merely making the authorization and that the Appropriations Committee later would consider each additional request for appropriation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is exactly what the Appropriations Committee has done in this instance and what the Committee is doing today—it is considering each ship as it comes in.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not necessary for the Committee on Appropriations to hold hearings on those very items that have been authorized?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all; because Congress has already authorized it and it is not necessary unless the committee desires to do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The hearings speak for themselves.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Further, it is not mandatory on the part of the committee. The committee may refuse to appropriate any money for building up a treaty navy. The authorization merely makes it in order for any Member to offer an amendment to accomplish this purpose.

Let me say before I proceed further that no one in this House is more interested in seeing that some agreement is reached between maritime nations to limit armaments than I am, but we have been taught conclusively that disarmament by example is a complete failure. This great Nation of ours for 8 or 10 years stood quietly by and refused to build a ship, hoping other nations would follow our example. What happened? Other nations were rapidly building up their navies to the treaty strength. In the treaty of 1922 in Washington and the treaty of 1924 in London it was determined that this country required 15 battleships for its national defense, the same number allotted to Great Britain. We are merely asking Congress to live up to our treaty, to do what the treaty authorized to be done, to maintain the Navy at sufficient strength to afford adequate defense to the country; that is all, no more, and no less.

The authorization for these two ships is no addition to the naval budget. They are going to cost some \$40,000,000 before they are completed, of course; but what happens if Congress today refuses to continue a replacement program? By that action we would lose the advantage we retained at the conference when we refused to accede to the desire of other nations to have a navy equal to ours. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, at all times to maintain the ratio of 5-5-3. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, stated that it is not customary for the Appropriations Committee to hear testimony on appropriations after the legislative committee has already authorized the particular items. If this be so, I ask the gentleman the purpose of this big book we have here. This is the hearings on the Navy Department appropriation bill for 1937. Every word of testimony in this book relates to appropriations for items that are already authorized by the Congress of the United States. In other words, the Appropriations Committee does not consider any appropriation that has not already been authorized by the Congress; and it seems to me this big volume of hearings is conclusive evidence of the fact the gentleman from Georgia is in error.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Of course, it is wholly within the prerogative of the Appropriations Committee to inquire into these things.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is true.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But the committee was so satisfied that the policy of the Government was sound in advocating a treaty navy that it made no inquiry.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is just the point I have been trying to make in this House for several years. The Appropriations Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and the Naval Affairs Committee are all satisfied that we need a big army and a big navy without limit, without having any hearings whatsoever.

They are satisfied because these committees are packed, and I say they are packed with men of honor, men of integrity, but men who are sold on the idea that adequate national defense means the biggest conceivable Army and Navy we can get. They are willing to authorize these two capital ships without offering the testimony of any experts. This Congress today, Mr. Chairman, has gone wild on the question of national defense and are preparing for some imaginary enemy. We are preparing for some war in the future with some foreign power, not a war of defense.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is just one more piece of evidence of the fact that these committees which handle appropriations and the national defense of this country are stacked. I do not make that statement with any feeling against the House or those who are members of these particular committees. I do make the statement, however, that the committees charged with the national defense, both the legislative committees and the appropriation committees, are composed of ultra 100-percent big-army and big-navy men. Those of us in the House who have views contrary to them do not have any chance whatever to express our views. We cannot have that chance because it is impossible for Members who do not believe in a big navy to get their views before such a committee. You do not find in such committees very many people fighting these big appropriations. Mr. Chairman, I do not make that statement because I want to criticize any man for his views. He is entitled to his view the same as I am. I submit, however, that the viewpoint of those who do not believe in a big army and a big navy are not adequately expressed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to speak at length on this question, but I want to call attention to the fact that when you appropriate \$50,000,000 for a battleship you are really appropriating \$100,000,000. According to the best naval authorities you have to build one cruiser that costs twenty to thirty million dollars, you have to build four more auxiliary cruisers, you must build submarines, you have to put a fleet of aircraft around this monster of the deep to protect it from being sunk, all of which will cost more than \$100,000,000. You are not voting for \$104,000,000 for these two ships. You are really voting for \$208,000,000. That is what you are voting for.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. These are mere replacement ships. We already have the auxiliaries to defend these ships.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Oh, yes; I have heard all about those replacements. You build navies and call them by all sorts of fair names, replacements and what not, but you are always building. You have men here—and they are fine gentlemen, of course—who think they have to save the world. They think we must be the policeman of the earth. They think we must go out and swagger around this globe telling other nations how to govern themselves. I am tired of that sort of thing, and I know the American people are tired of it. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not true, if these two new capital ships are built, we have not the auxiliary equipment with a sufficient speed to support those ships anywhere on the ocean?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I think that is probably correct, and this means that we have to build, not only the auxiliary vessels for these two ships but a lot more auxiliary vessels. So far as I am concerned, I am in favor of the drydock for the Hawaiian Islands. I would vote for the construction of a drydock at San Diego. I would vote for the construction of a drydock at the Panama Canal. If you are going to build vessels, you have to have facilities to take care of them. What I am arguing against is building of these ships which will compel us to engage in more expenditures than are involved in the proposed appropriation. I stand for a navy for defense of our coasts and our islands and possessions. I oppose any navy which contemplates aggression—a navy which means that we are to spill good American blood to make good the investments of un-American international bankers who know no country, who have no patriotism, and whose only god is the god of gold.

I am a veteran of one war. I served in Congress throughout another war. It is time to care for our veterans' widows and orphans of these wars before we engage in another war. If you want to chart a correct course, if you want a North Star to follow, read the Farewell Address of George Washington and remember his words, "Why stand on foreign soil?" Why embroil ourselves in the quarrels and intrigues of Europe?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is nothing in the world but the carrying out and continuation of a definite fixed policy of the Government to maintain and have a navy which will be up to treaty strength. Under the provisions of the treaty it was impossible to replace a battleship until it reached 26 years of age. This is merely a replacement.

Mr. Chairman, are the Members of this House willing to have the sailors of this country forced to serve upon old antiquated ships that are over age? Are the Members willing to send their sons to defend this country in ships that may be classified like some of the aviation was classified during the World War, "flying coffins"?

We are simply asking that these ships be replaced that the treaty authorizes us to replace after attaining 26 years of age.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Are there not 40 or 50 pages of testimony on destroyers?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; they have all the information on destroyers.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But not a word on the battleships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I want to say now this Appropriation Committee has rendered a distinct service to this country in the kind and character of bill they have brought in here. As an evidence of that, not a single amendment has been adopted nor has a single amendment been offered to the bill, except as offered by the gentleman from New York, in which he seeks to destroy the treaty navy of this country and force us to rely upon inadequate defense, upon the mercy, the pity, and love of other nations.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And that is just why, I suppose, the committee did not adopt this particular item until 2 days ago. They did not adopt the item until last Tuesday.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The committee adopted the item just as soon as the London Conference broke up. This Government went as far as any nation ever has in history to bring about a limitation of armament.

I stand here today and say that no Member on this floor is more determined to see armament reduced than I am, but I am unwilling for this country to be unprepared. I am unwilling for our treaty Navy to fall below that which this Government feels is necessary to afford adequate defense, and I certainly trust that this Committee will vote to maintain a treaty navy by authorizing these two ships, which are replacements of ships that are 26 years of age, and vote down the amendment of the gentleman from New York. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 25, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Page 49, line 23, after "(b)", strike out the balance of the page, and on page 50, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 and insert "destroyers, submarines, and airplanes divided equally in number to the amount of \$115,300,000."

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Is it not true that the time has previously been limited and that all debate has expired on this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is correct. The debate was limited and the time has expired, but the gentleman from Connecticut submits the unanimous-consent request to proceed for 3 minutes.

Mr. UMSTEAD. I shall not object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, the vote just taken emphasized the fact that the House is determined to appropriate \$115,300,000 for two battleships. My amendment would strike out the two battleships and in lieu thereof insert destroyers, submarines, and airplanes which, according to my understanding of defense armament, are the instruments that will accomplish what we are all trying to bring about, namely, an adequate defense. If battleships come here from foreign lands we will have these destroyers and airplanes ready to meet them, and it will be unnecessary for us to send our ships out on the seas to meet ships that may come to attack or invade our country.

I wish to emphasize that this country has adopted the policy of a good neighbor. Battleships emphasize bad neighbors. Implements of defense, such as planes and submarines and destroyers, as provided for in the amendment, will evidence to the people of America and the people of the world that our only purpose in arming ourselves is for defense. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. VINSON of Kentucky, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

The Clerk read the motion to recommit, as follows:

Motion to recommit offered by Mr. MARCANTONIO: "I move that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with the instruction to report back forthwith with the following amendment: 'On page 49, line 23, after the word "submarine", strike out all of the language up to and including the figures "\$115,300,000", on page 50, line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$111,300,000."'"

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were 28 ayes and 100 noes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 73, nays 212, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—73

Amlie	Crosser, Ohio	Kopplemann	O'Malley
Andrews, N. Y.	Dondero	Kvale	Patterson
Ashbrook	Dunn, Pa.	Lambertson	Rankin
Biermann	Elcher	Lemke	Rich
Binderup	Engel	Lewis, Md.	Sadowski
Blackney	Fletcher	Luckey	Sauthoff
Bolleau	Focht	Ludlow	Schneider, Wis.
Brewster	Fulmer	Lundeen	Scott
Buckler, Minn.	Gehrmann	McFarlane	Sisson
Burdick	Gilchrist	Maas	South
Carlson	Gingery	Mahon	Stefan
Carpenter	Guyer	Main	Thom
Cartwright	Gwynne	Marcantonio	Thomason
Chandler	Hancock, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Whelchel
Christianson	Hildebrandt	Massingale	Wilcox
Citron	Hope	Maverick	Withrow
Coffee	Hull	Michener	
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Monaghan	
Crawford	Knutson	O'Day	

NAYS—212

Adair	Costello	Ford, Calif.	Kinzer
Allen	Cox	Ford, Miss.	Kniffin
Arends	Cravens	Frey	Kocialkowski
Bacharach	Crosby	Fuller	Kramer
Bacon	Cross, Tex.	Gassaway	Lambeth
Bankhead	Crowe	Gearhart	Lanham
Barden	Cullen	Gifford	Lewis, Colo.
Barry	Cummings	Gildea	McAndrews
Beam	Curley	Goodwin	McClellan
Beiter	Daly	Granfield	McCormack
Bell	Darden	Gray, Ind.	McGehee
Bland	Darrow	Gray, Pa.	McKeough
Blanton	Dear	Green	McLaughlin
Bloom	Deen	Gregory	McLeod
Boland	Delaney	Haines	McMillan
Boylan	Dickstein	Hart	McReynolds
Brown, Ga.	Dies	Hartley	Mapes
Buchanan	Dingell	Healey	Marshall
Buck	Dirksen	Hess	Martin, Colo.
Burnham	Ditter	Higgins, Mass.	Mason
Caldwell	Dobbins	Hill, Ala.	May
Cannon, Mo.	Dorsey	Hobbs	Mead
Carmichael	Doxey	Holmes	Meeks
Carter	Drewry	Hook	Merritt, N. Y.
Casey	Driscoll	Houston	Millard
Castellow	Driver	Imhoff	Miller
Cavichia	Duffy, N. Y.	Johnson, Tex.	Mitchell, Tenn.
Celler	Duncan	Johnson, W. Va.	Moran
Church	Eagle	Kahn	Mott
Clark, N. C.	Eckert	Keller	Nelson
Cochran	Evans	Kelly	Norton
Colden	Faddis	Kennedy, Md.	O'Brien
Cole, Md.	Fenerty	Kennedy, N. Y.	O'Connor
Colmer	Fitzpatrick	Kennedy	O'Leary
Cooper, Tenn.	Flannagan	Kerr	O'Neal

Owen	Ransley	Sirovich	Vinson, Ga.
Parsons	Rayburn	Smith, Conn.	Vinson, Ky.
Patman	Reed, Ill.	Smith, Va.	Wallgren
Patton	Reilly	Snell	Walter
Pearson	Risk	Somers, N. Y.	Wearin
Peterson, Ga.	Robison, Ky.	Spence	Weaver
Pettengill	Rogers, Mass.	Stewart	Welch
Peyster	Rogers, N. H.	Sullivan	Werner
Pfeifer	Russell	Summers, Tex.	West
Pierce	Sanders, Tex.	Sutphin	White
Pittenger	Sandlin	Taber	Whittington
Plumley	Schaefer	Terry	Williams
Polk	Schuetz	Thompson	Wilson, La.
Powers	Scrugham	Tolan	Wilson, Pa.
Rabaut	Secrest	Tonry	Wolcott
Ramsay	Shanley	Turner	Wolfenden
Ramspeck	Shannon	Turpin	Wolverton
Randolph	Short	Umstead	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—142

Andresen	Edmiston	Kleberg	Rogers, Okla.
Andrew, Mass.	Ekwall	Romjue	Ryan
Ayers	Ellenbogen	Lamneck	Sabath
Berlin	Englebright	Larrabee	Sanders, La.
Boehne	Farley	Lea, Calif.	Schulte
Bolton	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Sears
Boykin	Fernandez	Lehlbach	Seger
Brennan	Fiesinger	Lestinski	Smith, Wash.
Brooks	Fish	Lord	Smith, W. Va.
Brown, Mich.	Gambrill	Lucas	Snyder, Pa.
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	McGrath	Stack
Bulwinkle	Gavagan	McGroarty	Starnes
Burch	Gillette	McLean	Stegall
Cannon, Wis.	Goldsborough	McSwain	Stubbs
Cary	Greenway	Maloney	Sweeney
Chapman	Greenwood	Mansfield	Tarver
Claiborne	Greever	Merritt, Conn.	Taylor, Colo.
Clark, Idaho	Griswold	Mitchell, Ill.	Taylor, S. C.
Collins	Halleck	Montague	Taylor, Tenn.
Connery	Hamline	Montet	Thomas
Cooley	Hancock, N. C.	Moritz	Thurston
Cooper, Ohio	Harlan	Murdock	Tinkham
Corning	Harter	Nichols	Tobey
Creal	Hennings	O'Connell	Treadway
Crowther	Higgins, Conn.	Oliver	Utterback
Culkin	Hill, Knute	Palmisano	Wadsworth
Dempsey	Hill, Samuel B.	Parks	Warren
DeRouen	Hoeppel	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Dietrich	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.	Wood
Disney	Hollister	Quinn	Woodrum
Dockweiler	Huddleston	Reece	Young
Doughton	Jacobsen	Reed, N. Y.	Zimmerman
Doutrich	Jenckes, Ind.	Richards	Zioncheck
Duffey, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	Richardson	
Dunn, Miss.	Jones	Robertson	
Eaton	Kee	Robinson, Utah	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Knute Hill (for) with Mr. Wigglesworth (against).

Mr. Tobey (for) with Mr. Cary (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Boehne with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Lord.
 Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Reece.
 Mr. Warren with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Montague with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. Woodrum with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Bolton.
 Mr. Sears with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Hollister.
 Mr. Tarver with Mr. Tinkham.
 Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania with Mr. Perkins.
 Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Andresen.
 Mr. Corning with Mr. Crowther.
 Mr. Fiesinger with Mr. Thomas.
 Mr. Duffey of Ohio with Mr. Merritt of Connecticut.
 Mr. Maloney with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
 Mr. Stegall with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Schulte with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Robertson with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Lehlbach.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Collins.
 Mr. Samuel B. Hill with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Ekwall.
 Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Culkin.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Jones with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Lucas with Mr. Dempsey.
 Mr. Ayers with Mr. Quinn.
 Mr. O'Connell with Mr. Young.
 Mr. Montet with Mr. McGrath.
 Mr. Creal with Mr. Jacobsen.
 Mr. Hennings with Mr. Parks.
 Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Gillette with Mr. Richards.
 Mrs. Jenckes of Indiana with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Stack with Mr. Connery.
 Mr. Dietrich with Mr. Wood.
 Mr. Murdock with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
 Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Farley.
 Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Cooley.
 Mr. Richardson with Mr. Brennan.
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. Kee.
 Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Sanders of Louisiana.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Chapman.
 Mr. Claiborne with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Harlan with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Nichols.
 Mr. Ferguson with Mr. Clark of Idaho.
 Mr. Harter with Mr. Kloebe.
 Mr. Ryan with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
 Mr. Starnes with Mr. Disney.
 Mr. Stubbs with Mr. Edmiston.
 Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Buckley of New York.
 Mr. Ellenbogen with Mr. Zloncheck.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. Palmisano with Mr. Robinson of Utah.
 Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Taylor of South Carolina.
 Mr. Berlin with Mr. Oliver.
 Mrs. Greenway with Mr. Brooks.
 Mr. McGroarty with Mr. Lee of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Moritz with Mr. Utterback.

Mr. KELLER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FULMER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Mr. ANDREW and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, are unavoidably absent on account of illness. If they were present, they would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Iowa, Mr. UTTERBACK, is unavoidably absent. If present, he would have voted "aye" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. KEE, is unavoidably absent. Had he been present, he would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit.

NEW LABELS FOR OLD POISONS

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent accorded me to extend by remarks, I include the stenographic report of a radio address delivered by me in Washington on Wednesday, April 29, 1936, over the stations of the Columbia Broadcasting System, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, in his first inaugural address to the American people, George Washington issued a significant warning that may well serve as the text of the remarks I am called upon to make tonight when he said: "The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people." For, to his comprehensive and prophetic vision, liberty and the republican model of government were kindred virtues, whose preservation was consigned to our Nation and our people in trust for a fortunate posterity.

That freedom and republican government have been justified of their children in America is evidenced by the fact that under our system America in less than a century had grown to preeminence in world affairs, bestowing upon her people such peace, happiness, and prosperity as had theretofore been unknown among nations and men. Our commerce whitened the seas. Our pioneers marched onward across mountain and river and plain toward the setting sun, to form the skirmish line of the new and mighty American civilization. Our land was gridironed with railroads, honeycombed with mines, tasseled with harvests, humming with industry, and America, producing more human wealth than had been created by all other nations and individuals since Omnipotence laid the foundations of the world, set her feet upon the oceans and her head among the stars, the fairest daughter of democracy, the queen of the family of nations.

There are today men in our midst who declare that such progress must now end. The chapter of liberty, they tell us, is now concluded. There are those who, like Mr. Rexford Tugwell, assert

that we have a century and more of development to undo, and arrogantly claim that they will remake America according to plans radically foreign to the old liberalism under which our country became the envy and the admiration of the world.

During the last 3 years we have heard rumors of ominous forebodings and been witness to strange events. For the first time in American history, there has been a unified, cohesive effort to divide and destroy American regard for our traditional liberties and opportunities by the ruthless arraying of class against class, and the imputation of motives of dishonesty and selfishness and greed to all of those who differ with either the purposes or the methods of the inexperienced young men now mismanaging your Government here at Washington. During these months, millions of our people for the first time have been taught to hate other Americans. Other millions have been systematically urged to bear false witness and to covet the possessions of their more successful neighbors. Millions more—and I refer not to the deserving needy but to the many who are well able to care for themselves—have been sedulously educated to believe that the Federal Government owes them a living and that they owe their fellow citizens and the Government nothing—not even the formal tribute of a salute to the flag.

Into the political tranquillity that, with few disturbances, has for generations characterized American life, there have been suddenly injected the restless teachings of alien-minded theorists whose ideas are so foreign to accustomed American thought that they require a strange and not yet completely familiar terminology to import them into American political speech.

In other campaign years, ladies and gentlemen, you heard the familiar names of Democrat and Republican, the tariff, the full dinner pail, 16 to 1, and the like. Today, we are urged to think in terms of the classes and the masses, of regimentation, of planned economy, of the totalitarian state, of experimental habits of mind, of what Under Secretary of Agriculture Tugwell calls the third economy (and I make no allusion to its similarity to the Third Internationale), of the farmer-labor warfare, of entrenched greed, of liberal parties, and other terms born in the chancelleries of foreign lands. And while in normal times we might ignore these words as in themselves innocent and innocuous (though many a well-turned phrase has changed the destiny of an empire), we have today in our National Government men who are temperamentally disposed toward the dramatic solely because of its drama, who are allured by what they call "bold experimentation", who admire the new simply because of its novelty, men of what Gov. Alfred E. Smith would call the "Knickerbocker" type—who hug to their hearts the flattering illusion that the Almighty has ordained them alone to supervise and to dominate the lives of all other men. You can catch a glimpse of this attitude of mind in President Roosevelt's amazing declaration that the mechanics of civilization came to a dead stop the day before he was inaugurated—only, presumably, to have started again as soon as he took the oath to defend and preserve the Constitution.

While it is not my purpose to issue a blanket indictment of the Democratic administration, realizing that we must obliterate the evil, while conserving the good, yet after 3 years of New Deal vivisection on the helpless American body politic, we find the victim dangerously worse than when the national experimenters began to juggle the wrong surgical instruments and to confuse the political test tubes. It affords little consolation to the patient to know that the operation was a "scientific" success, if he must die to prove its scientific value.

So, under the "brain trust" policy of promoting scarcity in a hungry land, our bread lines have lengthened, our relief rolls have expanded, and the unemployed wearily walking our city streets have increased to the terrifying total of over 12,600,000.

Is it any wonder that you are today so heavily burdened with taxes, is it surprising that the prices for the necessities of life are so high, when, for instance, millions of your American dollars are spent to provide seed for farmers, and then you are taxed to provide funds to pay the farmer for not sowing all of it? Next you are taxed to pay the farmer for plowing under his planted crops, thus wasting whatever money was used for seed, and then you are compelled to pay extravagant prices for food because your money helped the farmer to create a shortage. Finally you are taxed to buy imported foodstuffs—simply because our own farmers have not been permitted to produce sufficient for our needs.

That is what is known as "brain trust" intelligence. That is planned economy substituted by the Democratic administration at Washington for the economy of nature and the plan of Nature's God. It somehow never seems to occur to the New Dealers that the attempt to alleviate hunger by the destruction of crops is tantamount to the folly of seeking to fatten a calf by reducing its food supply.

Now, add to this the morally and politically indefensible policy which, on the one hand, takes millions from you in taxes to pay for making land less fruitful, and, on the other, squanders additional millions for irrigation projects intended to make the land more productive, and you have a fairly vivid panorama of the antics of the Democratic New Dealers in their endeavor to arrogate to themselves the functions of divinity.

Under the Democratic delusion that we were producing a surplus of farm products, you American farmers were compelled to take approximately 30,000,000 acres out of production, thus producing less and increasing our food prices. The result is that you are creating a more abundant market for cheaply produced foreign farm products of a type similar to those you restricted. As a con-

sequence of this New Deal policy of sabotage, this land of ours that has been the granary of the world is, for the first time in our history, compelled to purchase food from foreign nations as a substitute for that which the administration has destroyed.

Though we can produce sufficient wool for our needs, under the New Deal last year we imported over 200,000,000 pounds of foreign wool. Though we are able to supply our own bread, the New Deal last year forced us to import over 27,000,000 bushels of wheat—an increase over 1934 of 255 percent. Though, if unmolested, our farmers can grow sufficient corn, under the New Deal we imported in 1935 over 43,000,000 bushels—an increase in 12 months of over 1,300 percent. Our dairies are now filled with butter churned in Denmark and Holland, twenty-two and one-half million pounds—an increase in a year of nearly 2,000 percent. Similar and varying increases are found in the imports of beef, cattle, rye, flax, barley, poultry, bacon, lard, eggs, and other products. While you American farmers are wondering what may happen to your farms, foreign farmers jubilantly acclaim the New Deal which is thus building up their markets here—and the moneys that are collected from the American worker are being wantonly siphoned off to enrich the farmers of Rumania and Brazil, of Egypt and Argentina, of Japan and the British Empire, and other foreign lands.

No one will blame the needy American farmer for accepting the checks which the "brain trust" professors have sent him for curtailing his crops—but our farmers are beginning to wonder who it was that received the huge benefit payments under the A. A. A. Is it not curious that Secretary Wallace is so reluctant to make public the names of those beneficiaries who have each received benefit payments of \$10,000 or more in a single year? Why must these facts be hidden from the people? Is it because the Democratic theorists of Washington are fearful lest the people, who are paying 53 New Deal taxes on a loaf of bread, discover that the administration paid one farmer \$219,000 for not raising 14,587 hogs—and one cotton planter \$168,000 for not planting 7,000 acres of cotton? Are the Greek letter collegians afraid we may ascertain that one New York bank financially interested in a Puerto Rican sugar property received a generous check for \$705,488 from the people's money, while another Puerto Rican sugar company was generously granted a million dollars of your funds for restricting its planting of sugarcane? Money from your pockets to pay for crops not planted, for improvements not needed, for projects un contemplated even by the most visionary, for goods not made, for pigs not born, for land not cultivated, for mortgages not paid—millions for reform of our Government, millions of dollars a year for printing New Deal propaganda, news sheets, press agents, for New Deal theaters for the production of plays by Communist authors—while our hungry cry for bread and our unemployed increase to a total that is greater than that of all Europe!

Thus, with ever-quicken pace, the New Deal gleefully rushes the American people toward national bankruptcy and individual ruin at the rate of \$20,000,000 a day—half of it a deficit—over \$13,000 a minute, day and night.

Even during the time I am speaking to you tonight, the New Deal will spend over \$400,000 of money taken from you in taxes. You will not be surprised that such an administration has refused to make restitution to the people of the billion dollars illegally collected from the processors under the unconstitutional A. A. A.—and, as if to revenge itself upon the people for enjoying somewhat lower prices because of the Supreme Court's protection of our constitutional rights in the A. A. A. decision—the administration now has a bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to retain the employees of the defunct A. A. A. to carry out the new soil-conservation policy, and Secretary Wallace advises that the distribution of the new \$440,000,000 appropriation among those who cooperate will start next September, which, by a curious coincidence, happens to be exactly 2 months before election.

It must have been such an idea as this that New Dealer Harry Hopkins had in mind when, with that contempt for the ordinary citizen that has characterized the "brain trust", he said that the American people are "too dumb" to understand what is going on. Perhaps the wish is father to the thought, for it is upon the assumption that we are too stupid to realize what is being done to us—that the Roosevelt administration builds its hopes for 4 more years of unprecedented corruption, unblushing political coercion in public works, unparalleled intellectual dishonesty, and unashamed, un-American policies.

Of course, it would be bad enough if all this experimentation were done free of charge. But the Democrats are sending you such a tidy little bill for their professorial services that, by the end of the year, the national debt shall have reached the staggering sum of thirty-five thousand millions of dollars.

It is difficult to imagine so gigantic a sum as this, but perhaps you will realize how much \$35,000,000,000 are when I tell you that it is equal to almost 24 times the combined endowments of all colleges and universities in this country that so prides itself on the liberality of its expenditures for higher education. If you were to attempt to pay \$35,000,000,000, each American family would be forced to pay \$21 a week, almost \$1,100 a year. Such a sum is equal to \$35 a minute from the time of the birth of Christ. If your salary be \$2,000 a year, you would need to work 17,500,000 years to earn so much. A city of 100,000 people would require five and a quarter centuries of work to amass such a total. If you were to start counting 35,000,000,000 silver dollars at the rate of 90 a minute, 10 hours a day, you would have counted your first billion in 62 years, and your thirty-fifth billion 2,100 years later.

Take from your pocket a \$1 bill. It is 6 inches long. If you could weave a ribbon of dollar bills to the number of 35,000,000,000 and extend it around the earth, it would girdle our globe 140 times. Such a sum, ladies and gentlemen, is not merely money. It is the result of years of labor by millions of toiling, striving, suffering human souls.

Do you realize that if you work 6 days a week at the average American income, you are obliged to toil Monday and Tuesday for the Government before you begin to earn anything for your family? All January, February, and March of each year you work without pay—since your income for 3 months is paid out in taxes. Every baby born after June 1937 will inherit a tax of \$338—not to mention the additional family tax of \$1,800 to be paid as the Government bonds fall due.

It is not the wealthy who bear the burden of these taxes. The so-called "soak the thrifty" taxes yielded only enough income to pay the Government's upkeep for 10 days. If you were to take 100 percent of all incomes over \$5,000 a year (leaving the wage earner nothing for himself), this levy would meet the national expenditures for only 6½ months. To finance the Government under New Deal waste for last year alone would have taken two-thirds of all the wages and all the salaries of all the citizens of the United States except those on the Government pay rolls. Indeed, if all the money now in circulation in the United States were tonight seized by the Government, it would not pay one-eighth of the public debt, which, after the demise of this administration, will rest as a mortgage upon you and your children.

No human being objects to the payment of any amount to relieve those in want or distress or hunger; but what must we think of the fact that 3,000,000 people during the last fiscal year received money from the Roosevelt administration as a reward for pledging themselves not to work?

Americans are the most generous people in the world. Sometimes (as with the war debts), we are stupidly munificent. But even the most reckless of Americans has a right to be perturbed when he sees the money wrung from him in taxes on the articles of everyday use squandered for silly projects of no abiding value.

And as an example of this policy at its best—or worst—the county of Westchester, N. Y., was recently sent several tons of chloride of lime from the Works Progress Administration "for disinfecting flood areas." It made no difference to the New Deal that Westchester has had no flood to disinfect, for last year the amiable New Dealers gave \$600,000 of your money to the same county, although no one there requested it. It was to be used for "malaria-control projects." So Westchester put on its spectacles and searched all over the place for a good case of malaria, only to discover that no one had had malaria in all of Westchester's history.

While Jersey City received \$1,733 of your money to build bird houses, Jamesburg, N. J., was allotted \$40,000 for improving a football field and erecting a grandstand for almost 3,000 persons, although there are only 2,000 inhabitants of the town and the local school has never had a football team.

Then, New England hastens to compete with an allotment of \$51,000 for three new Civilian Conservation camps, only to find after they were built that there were no recruits. And so the camps were joyfully dismantled and moved all the way to Portland for storage.

Not to be outdone, Placerville, Calif., receives \$14,762 to build a lily pond. The fact that the people had no desire for a lily pond made no difference whatever. You people of Placerville are going to have a W. P. A. lily pond whether you like it or not. And while some of you California people may have difficulty in keeping your roof from leaking, President Roosevelt has seen to it that the horses at the State Fair in Kern County could experience no such trouble, for he allocates \$4,200 for this purpose.

I sometimes wonder what the grateful citizen of Waltham, Mass., must have thought when the New Deal allotted him nearly \$10,000 of your money to drain his piggery, when the local board of health could have made him do it for about a hundred.

It might be unkind to say to the New Dealers that there are more efficacious ways to spend the people's money than in teaching tap dancing to Chesapeake Bay lobstermen and clam diggers or counting caterpillars in thousands of towns, or even in providing a \$25,000 haven for homeless dogs at Memphis, where the animals are to have shower baths and be served their food in "all-aluminum pans." Yet, following the publication at your expense of the Department of Agriculture's dissertation on the love life of the bullfrog, there has been issued, at an appreciable cost to you, a study of the love life of the cow. That, of course, will be interesting to the bovine intelligence of the 25,000,000 cows in the United States. I do not blame you for smiling, ladies and gentlemen; but it is your money that is being wasted in this ridiculous and insane fashion.

But, wait—Chicago must be heard from. Out there 100 P. W. A. workers were paid to dig an 800-foot trench for a storm sewer. It took each man 4 days to dig 8 feet, and when the trench was completed it was found that the sewer had already been installed by a previous group. So a third group was paid with your money to fill the trench, and a good time was had by all.

No doubt you shall cease to wonder when I tell you that up in Burlington, Vt., an item of \$24,000 was allotted for repairing the reservoir, only to find that no repairs were needed. So the enterprising and undaunted New Dealers allotted \$62,000 to repair the community center—and there is no such building.

Then in New Castle, in Pennsylvania, at a cost of \$10,000 to you taxpayers, 32 able-bodied men were to spend 4½ months inspecting the spouting from all buildings to determine just where the rain and surface water go. A red fluid is placed in the surface water—and the New Dealers just follow the red line as it "goes 'round and 'round and comes right out" somewhere at your expense.

Millions of dollars of your money have been wasted upon such New Deal projects as paying men and women to teach grand opera to Ozark mountaineers, to make dolls out of old inner tubes, to write poems within a vocabulary of 900 words. Hundred of thousands have been allotted to pay men to make maps of the geographic distribution of ancient Greek dialects, to trace a genealogy of the Julian-Claudian line, to study the Roman coinage of the Alexandrian mint, to count two and one-half million words and determine the frequency of their use, to have artists fresco the walls of prisons, to count trees in city streets, to compute the variations of Russian rainfall, to measure the cubic contents of buildings, as in Allegheny County, Pa., at a cost of nearly half a million dollars; another half million to make New York bridge paths more attractive for horsemen; and other projects even less worthy, ranging from the \$18,000 plan to grow mushrooms in abandoned West Virginia mines to the great \$90,000,000 resettlement project of Secretary Tugwell which, with a staff that costs you one and three-quarter million dollars a month, hired 12,000 office seekers to provide work for 5,000 men. Every man has two bosses—a real embarrassment of riches, while the staff is spread over some 27 buildings and agencies.

Such, ladies and gentlemen, is the government of planned economy for which you are paying \$650,000,000 a year more than for your food, clothing, and rent. With repudiation of its promises, with a 70-percent expansion of governmental expenditures, with three-quarters of a million employees on its pay roll, with its increasing taxes and unemployed, with its warfare against freedom of speech, with its ridicule of the Supreme Court and our ancient liberties, the New Deal, the only willfully subversive Government in our history, this year demands that you give it a vote of confidence.

Such is the manner of all despotisms. And the New Deal is not new in this. Indeed there is no important phase of it that is less than 300 years old. The policies of the A. A. A. were tried when the Pharaohs of Egypt seized control of the grain and cattle of the land, just as those of N. R. A. were attempted in the price fixing of the China of Confucius. Lacking a supreme court such as ours, planned economy spelled ruin for the Roman Empire when the Provinces (like our own States) became dependent on the central government, and the Emperor Domitian ordered half the vineyards "plowed under" to promote scarcity. A thousand years later Henry the Eighth, of England, and his daughter Elizabeth anticipated the New Deal in the granting of endless monopolies, and when Henry the Eighth devalued the English coinage, he became an exemplary model for the Rooseveltian debasement of our own currency. Thus down the stormy road of history the policies which the professors call new have led ancient peoples to destruction, desolation, and despair.

It was the clear-sighted founders of America who first threw down the gauntlet to the theory of government by dictatorship, by government planning. They knew better than we that the specific temptation of Government in all ages is to seek additional power or misuse that which it has. They foresaw the possible rise of glamorous personal leadership, the displacement of law by current emotion, the danger of unwise action under temporary stress, and to avert these evils they devised certain safeguards. The President, the Congress, the courts were all made subordinate to the voice of the people as announced in their Constitution.

These three branches of government, with officers who conscientiously swear to preserve the constitutional charter of our liberty, were rendered completely independent of one another in the patriotic belief that never would all three unite against the people or their Constitution. When one branch, such as the Executive, seeks to undermine the Constitution, or when perhaps he might, by favor or coercion, win the support of a complacent, supine Congress—there still remains another, the Supreme Court—to speak for the people and with the people's tongue to express their veto of any attempt at dictatorial power.

George Washington foresaw the danger of usurpation by an ambitious Executive when he wrote: "It is important, likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those entrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding, in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. . . . If in the opinion of the people the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed."

There are those who, in a spirit of timid vacillation and unreasoning emotionalism, will cry, "You cannot eat the Constitution!" Well, my friends, you cannot eat the Ten Commandments or the Bible, but in their absence, man, made only a little less than the angels, would become little more than the brute. You could not eat the 22,000 regulations of the N. R. A. or the forgotten and vio-

lated promises of the Democratic platform. You cannot eat democracy, but "man does not live by bread alone", and without your Constitution guaranteeing your right to freedom of speech, of the press, of education, of religion, of equal opportunity before the law—without such liberty, all bread would be bitter, all drink would be as gall.

Of recent months some in high places have eaten away vital portions of the Constitution by direct attack and by subtle usurpation, and if it do not trouble their digestion, we hope it may disturb their consciences. For it is the Constitution which protects our human right to life and our human right to property. At times unphilosophical men confuse these rights, forgetting that the right to property is itself a human right—for if I have a right to life, none the less have I a right to the food which will sustain it. Property itself has no rights, but human beings have rights in property and duties as to its stewardship, and it was the realization by our fathers that property rights are natural rights which impelled them to declare that no person shall "be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law", just as the Ten Commandments given to Moses on Mount Sinai declared our duty to respect our neighbor's human right to life in the command, "Thou shalt not kill", and his human right to property in the injunctions, "Thou shalt not steal", "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

So beware of the sycophants who seek to convert their ambitions into emergencies by their own self-serving declarations and beguile us into a thoughtless sacrifice of principles by insidious promises or bold misrepresentation of actual facts. Let us not as Americans subscribe to the European delusion that the need of the hour is strong government. We need not strong government, but wise government, invested with the virtues of insight, dignity, moderation, tolerance, and an acute sense of social justice to all. For, while a strong government may drive men into artificial loyalty to its slogans and catch phrases and build itself into a brief interlude of power on the clever strategies of a clique, it is only wise government that, by deserving men's faith and trust, can draw them into authentic and abiding loyalty to its purposes. The true purpose of government, as a wise old Pythagorean declared twenty-five hundred years ago, is to secure that freedom which, without unity, is a delusion, and that unity which, without freedom, is a snare. The true statesman, mindful that he has a covenant with the dead and with the unborn, unwilling to sell the future into slavery or set the stage for chaos, even though he thereby reap temporary advantage, will seek to lead rather than to follow the moods of his time; he will realize, if he be faithful to himself, that the future of America must be entrusted only to those who, knowing her history, her traditions, and her ideals, cannot choose but love her.

It is in this spirit that the party of Lincoln, of McKinley, and Theodore Roosevelt faces the future. The new Republicanism is not in the making, ladies and gentlemen; it is already here! And in clinging to the ideals of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln, the Republican Party adheres to American principles, which, being ageless, are too old to be old-fashioned. Yes, the youngest, most liberal and vigorous force in the "new freedom" is the old Republican Americanism, for, being based upon the timeless and unchanging principles of human freedom and social values, the old ideals grow younger as the New Deal grows old. And it is because it is truly the party of the expansive, creative forces in American life that the voice of Republicanism is today raised on behalf of the really forgotten—the American taxpayer, the hungry, the increasing unemployed. It sends forth a tremendous challenge to the fallacies of the reactionary Rooseveltian collectivists, the Democratic money changers, whose crowning infamy it is that they have not hesitated to poison the well springs of democracy in order to win for themselves a purchased and fading popularity. Under the glittering pretensions of New Deal sophistry are the cruel policies of economic sterility, the Tory policies so alien to American ideals that they have won for President Roosevelt the enthusiastic support of communism, whose spokesman, George Dimitroff, advised his American comrades to work for the reelection of the President on the ground that he best represents the purposes with which they hope to subdue a free American people. Yes, my fellow citizens, these are perilous days, that call for clear thinking, comprehensive judgment, intelligent leadership, high accomplishment. Into our hands is given the future of a nation. So together we move forward to the restoration of American constitutional ideals, the rebirth of that soul-stirring, intangible, nontaxable, sacred thing called "freedom." As opportunism and self-aggrandizement winnow out the waverers, all true Americans will hasten forth to greet the dawn—in the realization that as long as American hearts shall fearlessly beat, as long as Republican tongues shall be chrismed with the love of liberty—so long shall the Constitution be the living soul of the Nation; so long shall the immortal spirits of our fathers stand on guard at the portals of the Republic, sentinel of deathless Republican devotion, custodian of America's imperishable destiny!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill be given 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Whom is the letter from?

Mr. SCOTT. It is from the Oakland branch of the League Against War and Fascism, from Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH—SOCIAL SECURITY—CONSERVATION—PEACE—
ALL ESSENTIAL TO OUR NATIONAL PRESERVATION

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of the RECORD, I desire to make a short résumé of subjects in which I am interested and in which I have taken an active part:

I

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Conservative newspapers approve fight

Freedom of speech and press, liberty of conscience, religious liberty, and academic freedom are essential to a democracy, and long before I came to Congress I fought for these rights. In Congress I have continued that fight. The RECORD will show that. And reference to the editorial columns of the various newspapers of America show their approbation by practically all groups in the journalistic world, including the most conservative and reactionary newspapers.

For many years I have made a study of the consequences of the loss of freedom.

Democracy must preserve civil liberties

I believe in the democratic form of government. I do not believe that democracy should use the methods of communism or fascism, or we cease to be a democracy. If we adopt a policy of persecution and do not allow the utmost liberality in civil liberties, we may go the route of certain foreign countries.

II

SOCIAL SECURITY

Have advocated since returning from France

I advocated unemployment insurance, old-age pensions, social security in general, ever since my return from France in 1919. I received a great deal of harsh criticism when I did, even from officials of the American Federation of Labor, who then opposed unemployment insurance.

I have made an especial study of old-age pensions and advocated them in my campaign. When I was a candidate, I stated that I was against the Townsend plan and that it was impossible. Since that time research has convinced me that this viewpoint is correct.

Townsend plan impractical

At the same time I realize that many of the people over the age of 60 have been imposed upon so much and have had the idea expressed to them in such fine phrases that many of them conscientiously believe in the Townsend plan. And it is true the United States of America is far behind many other countries in social security legislation.

Present act inadequate; must build up

The present act is by no means adequate to meet the situation of old-age security. Neither are the other features. But you must know this: I have received bitter opposition by certain reactionary elements because I even favored the Social Security Act.

This group that opposes me are really bitter about having any social-security legislation at all—they do not care to understand that social-security legislation will benefit them, their business, or their banking institutions, and themselves.

Conservative middle course best

Being opposed to the "Townsend plan", but in favor of social security, I have attempted to follow a conservative

middle course. In that way we can really build up social security gradually and have a plan which will not break down. To suddenly issue as the Townsend plan requires what amounts to \$23,000,000,000 extra money each year, would wreck the country to such an extent that in the beginning a loaf of bread would cost such a large amount of money—as it did in Germany during the weird period of printing money in hundreds of billions—that the \$200 a month would mean about \$30 a month or less. This would surely be followed by national bankruptcy and in a short time it would break the country.

So I proceed upon the assumption that to build up a social security plan in a reasonable, careful, conservative way is the best method.

III

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Conservation and housing must be encouraged

I consider the conservation of natural resources quite the most important problem before the American people. This is true not only of agriculture, but of city life as well. At the outset, I favor two things exactly in line with conservation:

First. Attention to the matter of prevention of soil erosion, reforestation, flood control, and preservation of our lands and waters in this country—and this will take the time of 3,000,000 men, who can be put to work.

Second. A Nation-wide housing campaign, which would put the building trades back to work, along with dozens of other allied trades and industries, to the extent of at least another two or three million men.

In these two matters I feel sure that, intelligently conceived, there ought to be put back into the real permanent economic activity of the country some five or six million American citizens.

Preservation of historic sites

Now, conservation has many aspects. I might mention that when I first came to Congress I introduced the "preservation of historic sites" bill, and the result is that an intelligent conservation of our historic sites has been begun for the United States of America. This is under the able direction of the Department of the Interior, of which Hon. Harold L. Ickes is the Secretary. This, however, is one of the minor phases of conservation.

Government programs

I have fought for the T. V. A., the building of Government dams, irrigation and reclamation, H. O. L. C., F. H. A., building, and the general development of the whole United States of America. I am convinced this is a proper course.

National Resources Board bill

Also I have introduced the National Resources Board bill which has been approved by the State planning boards of practically every State in the Union and by many engineering and technical societies and various units which have to do with planning and conservation—city, county, State, and National. This bill was approved in a letter to me by the President, who is strongly in favor of the National Resources Board being formed, and the purpose is to coordinate all information of any nature concerning resources. There already exists, by Executive order, a National Resources Committee and it is my purpose to have this made permanent.

As I said in the beginning, I consider this subject considerably more important than any of the others, because if we let our country blow and wash away we will have no use for such things as houses to live in, nor liberty, nor anything else.

IV

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE

Taking the profits out of war

In my first session in Congress I took an active part in the legislation to "take the profits out of war." This is the work which had been started by Congressman McSWAIN, of South Carolina, in the House, and by Senators NYE, CLARK,

BONE, and others in the Senate. Several of us got the bill out of the House into the Senate. Final legislation has not been enacted.

However, I am frank to say that the thing we must do is to stay out of war, rather than take the profits out of it. When we assume that we are merely going to take the "profits" out of war we more or less assume that there is going to be one. So it is more important to stay out of war altogether, and I have cooperated to that end.

Let us attend to our own business

I hold unalterably to the view that we must maintain neutrality and stay out of any wars or conflicts. Therefore, with Senators NYE and CLARK, I introduced the Nye-Clark-Maverick neutrality bill, the main features of which I have described in other speeches, and which was to keep this country completely out of foreign entanglements. I am told by some that this is a selfish policy, that civilization is likely to be destroyed unless in some way our country intervenes. However, I feel that we should attempt to save our own civilization first.

As for the League of Nations, the World Court, and the various other international organizations, I do not favor our entrance. Unfortunately, the League of Nations has been a failure, and we who live in this country have no reason to join it at this time when the membership has many secret aims of which we know nothing.

I think that what we should do, insofar as the international situation is concerned, is to stay home and to attend to our own business, get into no more wars, have an Army and Navy for defense only, make up our minds not to send our boys off to get killed anywhere else, and try to build up our own country and get our unemployed back to work. Eventually this Nation may join some world group of nations but not now.

V

CONCLUSIONS

I have merely mentioned a few of the things in which I have taken an active part. And I repeat the four things which I have mentioned today:

First. Freedom of speech.

Second. Social security.

Third. Conservation.

Fourth. Neutrality and peace.

Mr. Speaker, these four things are essential to the preservation of our country.

P. W. A. PROVIDES AID TO HOSPITALS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, when 512 hospitals, costing \$129,749,077, are completed as a part of the Public Works Administration's construction program, another 40,000 beds in addition to many other facilities will be made available to the general public throughout the United States and its possessions.

Of this total \$15,831,149 was allotted to the Federal hospital projects. The \$113,749,077 non-Federal hospital program was made possible by P. W. A. grants of \$38,802,801—the communities, counties, and States furnishing the remaining \$75,065,127.

For that reason it may be said that P. W. A. is enabling the medical world to keep step not only with scientific progress but with the demands of an increasingly hospital-conscious public by the total expenditure of \$54,683,950. It encouraged communities which volunteered to furnish the largest portion of the project costs; it footed the entire Federal hospital construction bill.

As it does so, these communities now find it possible to modernize their surgical and obstetrical departments, to install more efficient X-ray and other necessary laboratories, and to augment their facilities for stamping out tuberculosis and other contagious diseases. Public institutions, such as schools, have found it possible to set up complete clinics. Old hospitals, their working capital limited by the pinch of

the depression, have taken advantage of the opportunities P. W. A. offered by displacing their ancient furniture and instruments with new equipment.

Such building and replacement has created widespread work not only at the sites, but in the mines, forests, and mills where materials originate, and in the factories and laboratories which fabricate the raw materials into building products, furniture, and medical equipment.

There is something of a paradox in the P. W. A.'s hospital program. It started at a time when the number of institutions had been steadily dwindling. Since 1923 the total number of private, city, State, and Federal hospitals has fallen from 6,009 to 5,404 in 1935. This steady decrease, according to the American Medical Association's Journal, has resulted largely from intracity consolidations.

P. W. A., however, refused assistance to any overhospitalized city, county, or State. Projects were approved only where it could be proven that additional facilities or new hospitals were of vital necessity.

Although the number of hospitals has been decreasing since 1923, the number of beds available in the "surviving" units increased at a fairly steady rate until 1928. From that year on the number of beds, while continuing to increase, did so at a much slower rate. Only 12,692 beds had been added to American hospitals in 1932, a distinct drop from the 40,239 added during the preceding year. With the inception of the Public Works Administration, however, 21,055 beds were added between 1933 and 1934, and 28,249 between 1934 and 1935. P. W. A. officials have expressed the belief that by the time the construction program has been completed the normal rate of increase will have been resumed. During the last 26 years this "normal" rate has been 25,203 beds per year.

Medical authorities have expressed great interest in the P. W. A. program. There has always been considerable need for better obstetrical facilities. Expectant mothers are now arranging far in advance for hospitalization. The annual hospital census for 1935 shows that the total number of patients admitted was 7,709,942, a gain of 562,526 over the preceding year.

To date 109 hospitals are being either repaired or constructed under P. W. A.'s Federal program, involving the expenditures of \$15,831,149, and adding about 8,000 beds to Federal hospitals. These are situated in practically every State and possession of the United States.

The Eskimos of Alaska have benefited from the Federal program as well as those stricken with leprosy at the Virgin Islands. Many hospitals are being constructed on Indian reservations in Arizona, California, Iowa, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming, and Utah.

The War and Navy Departments are constructing hospitals and dispensaries in connection with their various military posts. The largest of these are the Marine Hospital at New York City, costing \$2,347,051, and the Naval Hospital at Philadelphia, costing \$2,350,000.

Of the non-Federal P. W. A. program there are 332 projects covering work upon approximately 400 hospitals. Dividing the non-Federal list into two classifications, those involving institutions which will add beds for hospital use and those which do not include beds, P. W. A. granted the \$38,802,801 to make possible this construction. P. W. A. loaned \$29,121,940 to applicants, while the applicants themselves furnished the balance of \$45,080,492, making the total of \$113,005,233.

Of this number, 202 projects made room for 32,178 beds. These institutions called for grants totaling \$28,386,695 for construction estimated to cost \$82,867,928.

Those projects not involving the additional beds numbered 130, and for them was allotted the total of \$10,416,106, making possible institutions estimated to cost \$30,137,205. Some of these projects involve repairs on several hospitals in the same city.

The Inspection Division informed the Administrator that hospitals actually completed and now occupied total 72 with

construction of an additional 246 hospitals under way. Only 39 are yet to be started.

Under the classifications of hospitals also come institutions which specialize in mental diseases or similar afflictions, of which 14 have been completed, 30 started, and only 2 yet to get under way.

An example of the manner in which P. W. A. came to the assistance of communities is that of the Allegheny General Hospital at Pittsburgh. When first planned this institution was to cost \$8,000,000. Work was started in 1929. In 1931 the funds were exhausted and it was necessary to suspend work until P. W. A. came to its assistance shortly after its inception in 1933. This building is now nearing completion. The nurses' home is already occupied.

FEDERAL LAND BANKS BECOME REAL-ESTATE SHARKS

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, and include therein an advertisement showing the foreclosure of lands by the joint-stock bank in the State of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a newspaper advertisement?

Mr. LEMKE. No. It is an auction advertisement showing the number of sales in one day.

Mr. RICH. Who made this auction notice?

Mr. LEMKE. The joint-stock land bank. It is a sale. I am trying to show the number of sales made in connection with foreclosures of farm mortgages.

Mr. RICH. It is made by some authentic Government agency?

Mr. LEMKE. I do not know whether that is a Government agency or not. I think it is.

Mr. RICH. If it is a Government agency I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot say whether it is a Government agency or not.

Mr. RICH. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says it is a Government agency, and therefore I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in the first place, I wish to thank each and every one of the 218 signers on petition no 7, which petition discharges the Rules Committee and brings the Frazier-Lemke refinance bill up for a vote and disposition on its merits on the floor. I can assure these 218 signers that the farmers of this Nation feel grateful to them for signing the petition and for their cooperation.

May I also say to those who have not signed that now that the bill is coming up on its merits, to lay aside all prejudice and meet the issue squarely and keep an open mind on the bill until the last argument is heard and the final vote recorded. If this is done, we feel confident of an overwhelming victory for the 2,000,000 farm families, consisting of 10,000,000 men, women, and children, whose homes are endangered by mortgage foreclosures. The Frazier-Lemke refinance bill is their only relief. Let us not be misled, the Federal land banks are not helping these farmers.

We have been led to believe by those defending the Farm Credit Administration and those defending the Home Owners' Loan Corporation that the mortgage foreclosure situation had been materially changed. Such are not the facts. According to figures prepared by the Division of Research and Statistics, Federal Home Loan Board, of Washington, D. C., the following facts are given:

In 1934 there were approximately 370,772 real-estate foreclosures. This includes both agricultural and urban foreclosures. In 1935 there were 366,802 such foreclosures, making a decrease of only 3,900 foreclosures in the year 1935 as compared with the year 1934.

If the total number and amount of mortgages on farms and homes had been taken into consideration, the percentage of foreclosures in 1935 would be considerably larger than in 1934. The reason for this is that the mortgaged indebtedness was considerably reduced by the foreclosures in 1934.

The Federal land bank is averaging more than 2,000 foreclosures per month, a picture quite in contrast with the one given here on the floor telling of the wonderful help the bank is giving to farmers. If to relieve them of their homes at the rate of over 2,000 per month is helping the farmers, the Federal land banks are succeeding wonderfully.

In addition to these foreclosures of the Federal land bank we have the foreclosures of the joint-stock land banks, an insolvent twin brother of the Federal land bank that is now in the process of liquidation.

I submit below an advertisement selling 82 farms in the State of Ohio by one of these twin brothers of the Federal land bank, the Virginian Joint Stock Land Bank. You will note that this real-estate shark, the despoiler of homes, gives free lunches and a free automobile so that it may get bidders to buy the homes taken away from the unfortunate.

In addition to these 82 farms sold by that institution, there are 9 city homes and 1 greenhouse, all, I presume, part of the property of the farmers who were foolish enough to believe that the joint-stock land bank would protect them in the hour of need at the time that they gave it the mortgage. The advertisement is as follows:

MAMMOTH AUCTION SALE—VALUABLE FARMS AND CITY PROPERTIES

Farms located in northern Ohio—Ashtabula, Geauga, Lake, Trumbull, Lorain, Mahoning, Medina, Portage, Stark, and Summit Counties. Farms located in Crawford County, Pa. City properties in Ashtabula, Ohio.

Properties to be sold Wednesday, April 22; Thursday, April 23; Friday, April 24, and Saturday, April 25.

Property descriptions and time of sales inside. You are cordially invited to inspect any or all of these properties on or before the day of sale.

For further information write or call S. Franklyn Woodcock, Inc., temporary office, Nettleton Building, 4718 Maine Avenue. Home office, Salisbury, Md. Temporary office, Ashtabula, Ohio. Telephone Ashtabula 1551.

Auction is a good and fair way to buy real estate.

DESCRIPTION AND SCHEDULE OF PROPERTIES TO BE SOLD

On Wednesday, April 22, as follows: 9 a. m., the Orr farm; 9:30 a. m., the Crosby farm; 9:30 a. m., the Browder farm; 9:30 a. m., the Beers farm; 9:30 a. m., the Obert farm; 9:30 a. m., the Allen farm; 10:30 a. m., the Cronin farm; 10:45 a. m., Trout farm; 11:30 a. m., Johnson farm; 12 m., the Magone farm (luncheon will be served at this time on the Magone farm; band will be in attendance); 1 p. m., the Wilson farm; 1:45 p. m., the Bigusiak farm.

Each of above-described properties will be sold from the property with the exception of the Browder, Beers, Obert, and Allen farms, which will be sold from the Crosby farm.

The following properties will be sold in and around Ashtabula, Ohio, Wednesday evening, April 22: 7 p. m., house and lot; 7:15 p. m., house and lot; 7:30 p. m., double house; 7:45 p. m., house and lot; 8 p. m., two building lots; 8:30 p. m., greenhouse and land; 8:30 p. m., 10 acres land; 8:30 p. m., property known as Hubbard, North Kingsville; 9:15 p. m., house and lot; 9:30 p. m., double house; 9:45 p. m., house and lot.

On Thursday, April 23, as follows: 9 a. m., Mary Brundage farm; 9:15 a. m., Bollinger-Oliver farm; 9:15 a. m., C. J. Lucas farm; 10 a. m., B. F. Traxler farm; 10 a. m., George A. Hoskins farm; 10:30 a. m., Joseph Wangard farm; 10:45 a. m., W. E. Good farm; 11:15 a. m., Frank Fishbaugh farm; 12 m., A. J. Clement farm (luncheon will be served on the Clement farm; band will be in attendance); 12 m., Alex Palko farm; 1:15 p. m., Alex Teresko farm; 1:45 p. m., Mike Szabo farm; 2:15 p. m., Andrew Subotnik farm; 2:45 p. m., Mary Drzadzynski farm; 3:30 p. m., Albert Gajda farm; 4 p. m., Milton Crabtree farm; 4:20 p. m., Fred Bailey farm; 4:50 p. m., L. R. Brigman farm; 5:15 p. m., L. E. Shore farm; 5:45 p. m., Hedwig Leikas farm; 6 p. m., M. J. Boccia farm.

On Friday, April 24, as follows: 9 a. m., F. R. Garver farm; 9:15 a. m., John Gatzko farm; 9:45 a. m., Jan Domanski farm; 10:15 a. m., Martin Parrish farm; 10:30 a. m., W. S. Reasner farm; 11 a. m., Stone Parrish farm; 11 a. m., Clarence Rockhill farm; 11:30 a. m., Joe Barnhardt farm; 11:30 a. m., Frank Kunert farm; 11:45 a. m., Rody Champion farm; 12 noon, Herman Paulsey farm; 12:30 p. m., Frank Klase farm (luncheon will be served on the Klase farm; band in attendance); 1:30 p. m., Martin Kurtzhals farm; 2 p. m., Clark Ferguson farm; 2:15 p. m., Korkowski farm; 2:15 p. m., Kotaska farm; 2:30 p. m., A. C. Hattendorf farm; 2:30 p. m., Peter Diamond farm; 2:45 p. m., Glen Elen farm; 2:55 p. m., George Craine farm; 3:15 p. m., Pavny farm; 3:45 p. m., John Kralik farm; 4:15 p. m., Abram farm; 4:30 p. m., T. D. Morley farm; 4:30 p. m., Sanborn farm; 5:15 p. m., John Murray farm; 5:45 p. m., Hausmann farm; 6 p. m., Harry Summers farm.

On Saturday, April 25, as follows: 9 a. m., Steve Kitko farm; 9:30 a. m., Elmer Barber farm; 9:45 a. m., Gino Rondino farm; 10:15 a. m., Franklin Swander farm; 10:30 a. m., Paul Neubert farm; 11:15 a. m., Wilbur Hauelsen farm; 11:45 a. m., Porter-Wells farm; 12:20 p. m., M. F. Brett farm; 12:20 p. m., B. J. Baker farm (luncheon will be served on the Loomis farm; band will be in

attendance); 1:30 p. m., the Harold Loomis farm; 1:30 p. m., Nick Solomon farm; 1:30 p. m., the Lester Mounts farm; 2:15 p. m., F. M. Wise farm; 3:15 p. m., the Jennie Smolich farm; 3:45 p. m., Joseph Romananoskos farm; 4:25 p. m., Marvin Ingraham farm; 4:45 p. m., L. C. Crile farm; 5 p. m., Elsworth Ray farm; 5:15 p. m., Mary L. Roice farm; 6:10 p. m., A. M. Johnston farm.

Own your farm—own your home—at your own price.

Our orders are to sell. Each property offered will positively be sold to the highest legitimate bidder, regardless of price. Your bids will make the price. This fact is assured by the following certified extract from our contract:

"The party of the first part (the Virginian Joint Stock Land Bank) does hereby authorize and empower said party of the second part (S. Franklyn Woodcock, Inc.) actually and in good faith to sell said properties to the highest bidders therefor at said sale, and does further covenant and agree not to bid upon said property or to authorize anyone else to bid for it or in its behalf for the purpose of increasing any other bid or bids on said properties or for establishing a minimum price at which said properties shall be sold."

This is to certify that the above is a true copy of the original agreement, and that I have compared the same.

THEODORE E. WARREN,

Notary Public, Ashtabula County, State of Ohio.

Remember the dates—April—Wednesday, 22d; Thursday, 23d; Friday, 24th; and Saturday, 25th, 1936.

Free! Free! Free! Plymouth sedan will be given away during this sale. Whether buyer or spectator, you have an equal chance to win this car. The winner must be on the property when the car is given away in order to participate.

For further particulars write or call S. Franklyn Woodcock, Inc., temporary office, Nettleton Building, 4718 Main Avenue. Home office, Salisbury, Md. Temporary office, Ashtabula, Ohio. Telephone, Ashtabula 1551.

Property descriptions and time of sale inside.

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a radio address I delivered this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address over National Broadcasting Co., May 1, 1936, as follows:

Much has happened the past 3 years in Washington that is repulsive to every sense of honesty and decency. We have been told by many high officials that everything that has happened in this country the past 150 years is all wrong. That we cannot go back to the "horse and buggy" days. That those things that have made us the greatest Nation on earth, those things that have given our farmers, our laboring men, our businessmen, our people in general, the highest standard of living of any nation must be cast aside, and in place of those things we must substitute certain experimentations, we must socialize our entire economic system. We are advised that the opinions of such distinguished Democrats as John W. Davis, ex-Governor Ritchie, of Maryland, of Alfred E. Smith, ex-Senator Reed, of Missouri, and many other prominent Democrats are all wrong. That in order to have a more abundant life we must be regimented under the plans and theories of Mordecai Ezekiel, Rexford G. Tugwell, Felix Frankfurter, and others. The American people will be called upon to decide within a few months whether they want to continue with the present program of alien tendencies or whether they want to be led by the soundness of a Lowden, a Knox, a Landon, a Dickinson, a Vandenberg. With the Federal Treasury as a campaign fund, with over 20,000,000 people receiving direct or indirect subsidies from a Tammanyized government, we are confronted with the proposition: Can a government, through vote-buying manipulation, buy an election and indefinitely remain in power? If it can be done in 1936, it can and will be done in 1940 and 1944.

With a supine and supercilious Congress under the domination of the Executive, with the realization that during the years 1936 to 1940 the Chief Executive will be called upon in all probability to appoint several members of the Supreme Court, we as Americans should pause and consider the consequences of returning the present administration to power. Of course, we know in advance of the Republican convention, whoever the Republicans nominate the Democratic leaders in a demagogic manner will immediately pull that old stuff, "He is a Wall Street man." But I don't believe the American people will be disillusioned.

We have seen under the guise of keeping people from starving the squandering of billions of dollars by this administration. Today we have a national debt of over \$33,000,000,000, and we have obligated ourselves for an additional five billions that will have to be paid. Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, stated yesterday before the Senate Finance Committee that there would be a Treasury deficit of \$6,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. According to him it will be an all-time high. How far can we go with this sort of thing?

Not paid by the rich, as the administration would lead us to believe, but by you and me, your children and my children. No one wants to see anyone starve; but the fact remains, as evidenced in all our communities, that while the unfortunate are receiving

a meager allowance, the Democratic spoilsman who are administering the relief are obtaining by far the lion's share. Perhaps the fullest demagoguery is practiced by the administration when they use such terms as "soaking the rich" and "driving the money changers from the temple." It is interesting to know that if the Government had confiscated all the wealth of all the millionaires in this country they would not have had enough money to run the Government the past 3 years. You and I are paying for the squandering—we are going to continue to pay. Every time a tax bill is passed putting additional burdens on companies, corporations, they naturally pass it on to the consumers. They add it to the cost of the manufactured article we buy.

We all readily admit that rich industries should pay—and pay well. Liberal taxes are necessary. But when we burden them with taxes that keep them from employing labor, building additions to their factories, or opening up new enterprises, we can't possibly return to a normal condition. The present 12,000,000 men and women out of work will continue to walk the streets. We had better turn an unhearing ear to all the poppycock of "soaking the thrifty." It would be well for us to insist that all these long-haired professors leave industry alone. Labor and so-called capitalism would soon get together, as they have done and are doing in England. While we have as many unemployed as there were in 1933, the depression in England is practically over.

As a result of not interfering with business in England, the industries in England have absorbed the unemployed; it has balanced its budget. Under the present reciprocal agreements millions of dollars' worth of goods from Japan and other countries are flooding our markets while our own factories remain closed, while the United States has been fiddling her time away with experimentations that have stifled trade. Without confidence capital cannot be invested. Without capital industry cannot go ahead. Without industry there cannot be jobs. Some members of the Democratic Party seem to be terribly put out that anyone should dare to find fault with the administration now in power. They fly into rage if anyone dares to question the soundness of any of Mr. Roosevelt's schemes. Have they forgotten that for more than 2 years the Republicans in Congress and out have been good soldiers? They gave the President his way, giving him every opportunity to put his views in operation. They were not obstructionists. While the Republicans remembered the "smear Hoover" tactics of the opposition party, they returned good for evil and for an unbelievably long time, even though they were not convinced of the soundness of many of the ideas, they allowed the President to pursue the course chosen by him with the voicing of scarcely any criticism. But the time has come when silent acquiescence in every proposal of Mr. Roosevelt and his "brain trust" has ceased to be a virtue. He is running past every danger signal and warning sign. It is time to call a spade a spade and to put the blame for halting recovery where it belongs. The first aggressive and violent attacks on the New Deal have come from the best brains of the Democratic Party.

If their last three candidates for President, two of their recent national chairmen, Governors and ex-Governors, Senators and ex-Senators, see fit to break from the New Deal and attack its principles and policies, is there any valid reason why we should longer remain silent when we are convinced that the New Deal is delaying economic recovery instead of promoting it? What about these prominent and outstanding Democrats? Surely their conviction as to the correctness of their views must be overwhelming when they desert their administration leaders and speak out openly against them. Suffice it to say that they are Americans first and Democrats second. Their party allegiance is not sufficient to lead them to follow the present socialistic administration. Mr. Roosevelt should remember that the millions of Democrats that have left him have done so because in 1932 they voted for Roosevelt because they believed him. They felt sure that when he accepted the Democratic platform he meant to follow it. They did not believe that it would be discarded for the Socialist platform.

New Dealers continually ask, What would you do? What is your program? What are your plans? I would say, "My program is covered by the very platform on which Mr. Roosevelt was elected." In taking care of the poor, the unemployed, "cut out the frills", as Governor Landon has aptly stated. Do away with the hundreds of thousands Farleyized and Tammanyized spoilsmen. Then there could be a reduction in expenses as promised by Mr. Roosevelt. Reduce all these alphabetical agencies and let the people run their own affairs as was promised. Help the "real forgotten man"—the small businessman—the man in the small store. While our daily newspapers record that large stores are paying large dividends, the small businessman, the storekeepers, are not receiving wages for their work. There are no profits for them.

Ask the small businessman what he thinks of the New Deal and the chances for his future. Ask the millions of young men and women that have worked their way through college what they think of the New Deal. What has this administration done for them? What is in future store for them? For 3 years these young graduates have walked the streets or worked with a pick and shovel. They have had about enough of that. This administration has failed them. They know that their individual initiative has been taken from them. They haven't much to look forward to, except to pay the huge debt that has been saddled upon them. They laugh when they hear about the \$20,000 dog pound that has been built in Memphis. They smile when they read about aristocrats being taught to play checkers at governmental expense, the teaching of tap dancing by governmental employees. They look with

scorn on the present spoils system, false expressions about planned economy, more abundant life, driving the money changers from the temple, and soaking the thrifty.

In conclusion let me say that if our institutions are to be preserved we must accept as our doctrines thrift, individualism, initiative; we must give employers that long-awaited-for breathing spell. We must insist that there be no class hatred; there is room enough in this country for capital as well as labor. If we do this, we will not have anything to worry about. Our Nation will continue, not as would Stalin, Hitler, Mussolini have it, but as planned by Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and others over 150 years ago.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HENNINGS, is unavoidably detained. If present, he would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit the Navy appropriation bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. DUNN, is unavoidably detained on account of the illness of his son. Had he been present, he would have voted "no" on the motion to recommit the Navy appropriation bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 315 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and leave out the letter. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in the closing days of the last session I introduced H. R. 9229, H. R. 9230, and H. R. 9231, bills which were designed to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 and to bring about justice to speakers, civic organizations, and so forth, in the discussion of political, social, and economic problems. The bills were designed to eliminate such practices as one that has just been called to my attention by the Utility Consumers League, 686 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Mr. John A. Trinchere, chairman of the Utility Consumers League, had been scheduled by station WNEW, of Newark, N. J., to deliver an address on the subject, Abusing Telephone Subscribers. On March 9, 1936, by telephone, and again on March 9, 1936, by letter, the station confirmed the address for Thursday, March 19, 1936, from 8:15 to 8:30 p. m. The speaker sent five copies of his address to the station 3 days in advance. These five copies were required by the station for press and Commission purposes. The copies were delivered in person on Saturday, March 14.

On March 18 Mr. Trinchere was notified by the special feature department of the station that the scheduled talk for March 19 had been postponed for a few days because the Federal Communications Commission was conducting a wide investigation of the American Telephone & Telegraph system.

On March 19 and 26 the league wrote demanding a show-down, and were informed that the postponed radio talk had been postponed for 3 weeks or longer pending the termination and outcome of the F. C. C.'s probe of the A. T. & T. The league failed to obtain from the station a written and official explanation for sudden postponement and subsequent cancellation. It was discovered on March 24 that the radio talk had been canceled and not postponed.

The purpose of the radio address was to expose the New York Telephone Co.'s gross abuses, evil practices, and so forth, found by the league's free complaint bureau and investigations carried on for a number of years. The radio talk was also designed to announce a State-wide drive for lower telephone rates, rental, and service charges, and appealing to the public to back Assemblyman Meyer Alterman's two telephone bills, nos. 661 and 662.

This is one specific case. Many others could be mentioned showing censorship by the stations at the instigation of large and powerful organizations. It is easy to see why A. T. & T. did not want a speech of this kind broadcast. The three bills I introduced would make such censorship impossible.

The Utility Consumers League charges—

First. That radio station WNEW is not operating in the public interest.

Second. That the station is violating the Federal Communications Commission's and the Federal Trade Commission's rulings as laid down on commercial continuities.

Third. That the station is misleading the public by announcing a series of news broadcasts as originating at the editorial offices of the New York Evening Journal, as in reality they took place at the station's studios.

Fourth. That after a radio address, topic, Abusing Telephone Subscribers, by John A. Trinchere, chairman of the Utility Consumers' League, had been scheduled by the station, the talk was suddenly canceled after all arrangements had been made; copies of speech passed and approved by the station.

Fifth. That the station, after two requests were made in letters of March 19 and 26, it persistently refused to furnish us with a written and official statement for canceling scheduled radio talk by John A. Trinchere.

Sixth. That the station deliberately deceived the Utility Consumers' League in making oral statements that the scheduled talk was postponed twice for reason of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. system investigation by the Federal Communications Commission at Washington, D. C., when the radio talk had been canceled all the while, and prior to March 19, night of radio address.

Undoubtedly other Members have received like protests or have been treated in the same manner. I therefore ask the Members of the House to get copies of H. R. 9229, H. R. 9230, and H. R. 9231, study them, and then if still interested to ask the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for a hearing on these bills.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to call the attention of the majority leader to the fact that these appropriation bills are all coming in here from the Senate for more than they were a year ago. I warn you as a Democratic Party that you must cut these appropriations down. [Laughter and applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE BOOK AND THE PAGE—PROOF REFUTING MENDACIOUS MIS- INFORMATION AND MISREPRESENTATION REGARDING LAW PRE- VENTING COMMUNISM FROM BEING INDOCTRINATED IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

[From RECORD, Mar. 3, 1936]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to incorporate some excerpts and data. The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

[From RECORD, Mar. 16, 1936]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 I received permission to extend my remarks and to incorporate some excerpts and data. I am waiting on some data from the Department, and I will not have it until Friday. I ask unanimous consent that instead of dating it on the 3d it may be dated next Friday the 20th.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. There was no objection.

[From RECORD, Mar. 23, 1936]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, on the 16th I secured permission to date my remarks on March 20, which on March 3, I got permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts from hearings and data which I am securing from the departments here in Washington. I find I will not be able to get all this data before Friday, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to extend the time for the extension of my remarks until next Friday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[From RECORD, Apr. 28, 1936]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the permission I had to extend my remarks on the District of Columbia appropriation bill expires today. On March 23, 1936, I obtained permission of the House to

date such remarks on Friday, March 27, 1936. I have been delayed in getting some necessary data from different bureaus of the District government which I wanted to use, and it will be next Friday before I get some of it. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the permission granted me be renewed so that my extension of remarks may be dated next Friday, May 1, 1936.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman from Texas extending his remarks on the District bill as indicated?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when it is due the people of the United States that there shall be corrected the wholesale misinformation and wanton misrepresentation which has been broadcasted over the Nation about the law, which on June 6, 1935, Congress passed, by the unanimous vote of both House and Senate, to stop communism from being indoctrinated in the public schools of the District of Columbia.

THE "REDS" CALL IT THE "RED RIDER"

This law was not misnamed, Mr. Speaker, because it does ride the "reds." It was not passed for them; it was passed against them. It was not to help the "reds"; it was to unhorse them. It was not to further their schemes; it was to stop them.

FALSEHOODS GALORE BROADCASTED

More deliberate, spiteful, malicious falsehoods have been broadcasted over the United States about this "red rider" than about any other law ever passed by Congress. It has been falsely asserted:

First. That it "was slipped into a conference report", when it was never in a conference report at all.

Second. That it "was slipped through the House without Members on the floor having a chance to know about it", when such was not the fact, and both the House Journal and the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prove just the contrary.

Third. That "BLANTON slipped it through", when the RECORDS show and the incontrovertible facts are that it was an amendment offered in the House by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, the Cannon amendment being read to the House by the Clerk from the Speaker's desk and voted upon by Members and passed the House by a unanimous vote; and that this "red rider" amendment was offered from the floor of the Senate by Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, was read by the Senate clerk from the Vice President's desk to the Senate, and was voted upon by the Senate and the Senate passed same by a unanimous vote.

Fourth. That "there was no occasion for its passage", when proof that is indisputable shows the contrary.

Fifth. That "it prevents proper factual instruction", when just the contrary is true, the facts being that Corporation Counsel Prettyman rendered to the Board of Education a decisive, clear-cut opinion holding just the opposite, advising the Board of Education that this law does not prevent proper factual instruction and does not prevent any teacher in any way from teaching the truth about communism, but all it does is that it prevents teachers from indoctrinating communism in the public schools.

Sixth. That "Comptroller General McCarl has interfered with the 'academic freedom' of teachers and required affidavits from them that prevents expounding proper 'factual instructions' to their pupils", when McCarl has made no such ruling whatsoever.

Seventh. That "teachers are insulted by having to make affidavit they have not taught communism", when the facts are that such affidavit was required only after Superintendent Ballou stubbornly contended that his teachers had the right to teach what they pleased, and that Congress could not restrict them, and refused to instruct his teachers that they must follow the ruling of Corporation Counsel Prettyman and not attempt to indoctrinate communism, and it was proposed to Superintendent Ballou that if he would instruct his teachers to follow said Prettyman opinion, then Comptroller General McCarl would no longer require the affidavits, but Ballou stated emphatically that "he did not care to so advise his teachers."

Eighth. That "the House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling the District appropriation bill had no authority to allow witnesses to testify about com-

munist in schools at their hearings", when said subcommittee did have full authority, and in no way exceeded its authority, Superintendent Ballou having requested said subcommittee to grant him \$78,660 for him to spend on his so-called "character education", concerning which the question of indoctrinating communism in the public schools was vitally and inseparably connected, and after hearing convincing evidence the subcommittee voted unanimously not to allow the \$78,660, and did not allow it, and thus saved \$78,660 from being subversively misapplied and wasted.

Ninth. That the said "House subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations conducted an inquisition, abused witnesses, did not give them time needed, and conducted an improper star-chamber proceeding", when all of such accusations were maliciously and mendaciously false in their entirety.

Tenth. That "the people of the District of Columbia want the 'Sissy bill' enacted and the 'red rider' repealed", when just the opposite is true.

Eleventh. That "the House of Representatives is practically unanimous in wanting the 'Sissy bill' enacted and the 'red rider' repealed", when both statements are untrue.

Twelfth. That "the hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on the District of Columbia accorded all witnesses fair treatment and warranted the passage of the 'sissy bill' and the repeal of the 'red rider' by the House", when none of such assertions are true and the falsity of same will be clearly shown hereafter by quotations from said hearings.

IGNORANCE PLUS MENDACITY

It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, for anyone to be ignorant of the real facts, to be wholly unfamiliar with the rules and precedents of Congress, to be wholly unacquainted with what goes on in the House of Representatives, and not know how its leaders transact business, and not know what it is all about, but where such ignorance is coupled with an absolute indifference to and disregard of the truth, and a spiteful, malicious mendacity, it eventuates in an intolerable situation, for people and newspapers all over the country thus get a perverted view, and repeat ad infinitum such misrepresentations.

THE BOOK AND THE PAGE

I intend now, Mr. Speaker, to take up one by one, and disprove by incontrovertible evidence, each and every one of the spiteful, malicious, and mendacious misrepresentations made about the "red rider." I will give the book and page on every one of them, so that no one ever again will dare repeat them or deny the probative force and effect of my proof.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NUMBER ONE

That the "red rider" was slipped into a conference report.

Not one word of the "red rider" was ever in the conference report, which is signed by ELMER THOMAS, CARTER GLASS, ROYAL S. COPELAND, WILLIAM H. KING, GERALD P. NYE, and HENRY W. KEYES, as managers on the part of the Senate, and by CLARENCE CANNON, THOMAS L. BLANTON, and J. W. DITTER, as managers on the part of the House, and is printed in full on page 8796 and also on page 8802 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 1935.

Anyone knowing the rules of the House would know that if the "red rider" had been placed in the conference report it would have vitiated the entire report, and made it subject to a point of order, for the reason that Senate amendment no. 48, being legislation, could not be agreed to by the House conferees, but they were compelled to bring said Senate amendment no. 48 back to the House and allow the House to vote on same, and the "red rider" likewise being legislation which was added as a proviso to said Senate amendment no. 48 by vote of both House and Senate, it could not be put in a conference report, but had to be presented to the House for vote thereon. In the conference the House managers verbally agreed with the Senate managers that said Senate amendment no. 48 would be returned to both Houses, for both House and Senate to take action thereon, and that if the Senate managers, through Senator THOMAS, would pro-

pose to the Senate that it would add the "red rider" as a proviso to Senate amendment 48, the House managers, through Chairman CANNON, would propose to the House that it concur in said Senate amendment no. 48 with an amendment, adding said "red rider" as a proviso to said Senate amendment 48, both House and Senate conferees having a copy of said "red rider" in writing, and the above action was taken in the Senate by Senator THOMAS, and was taken in the House by Chairman CANNON, and "BLANTON" did not have one thing to do with said proceedings in either the House or Senate, as same were handled by Chairman CANNON and Senator THOMAS, they being the ones in charge of it, and who proposed to the House and Senate that Senate amendment no. 48 be amended by adding the "red rider" as a proviso to it. Hence, it is mendaciously false, and wholly without basis, to state that the "red rider" was "slipped into the conference report", when not one word of the "red rider" was ever in the conference report.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 2

That the red rider was slipped through the House without Members on the floor having a chance to know about it.

The above assertion is absolutely false. There is not one word of truth in it. The following House proceedings are quoted verbatim from page 8808 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, permanent, of June 6, 1935:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: 'Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payments of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the foregoing amendments were agreed to was laid on the table.

You will note that the "red rider", or the law that prevents communism in the public schools, is the proviso to said Senate amendment no. 48, following the word "Provided." You will note that it was read by the Clerk in the House. You will note that the motion to adopt it was made by Mr. CANNON of Missouri. You will note that the motion was agreed to.

ANY MEMBER PRESENT COULD HAVE OPPOSED IT

All Members of the House who watch its proceedings and know what is going on knew that said conference report was before the House for final action. They knew that the Senate had inserted 114 amendments in said bill. They knew that some of these amendments were legislation, and had to be voted upon by the House. They knew, when they heard the Clerk read this proviso, which Mr. CANNON of Missouri offered as an amendment to Senate amendment no. 48, that it would prevent communism from being indoctrinated in the public schools. Any Member present could have opposed the motion made by Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Any Member present, who desired to do so, could have gotten time and spoken against Mr. CANNON's motion. They could have offered a preferential motion to concur in Senate amendment no. 48, which would have taken precedence over Mr. CANNON's motion to concur with the red-rider amendment. No one objected to Mr. CANNON's motion. No one asked to speak against it. No one offered any preferential motion. No one tried to stop it. No one voted against it. No one asked for a division on the vote. No one asked for the yeas and nays. It passed unanimously. No one objected when Mr. CANNON moved to reconsider and to lay that motion on the table, which made the said action of the House final. Anyone could have objected if they had desired.

WOULD PLEAD GUILTY TO NEGLECT OF DUTY

Where is the Member who will say he was asleep when Mr. CANNON made his motion to adopt the "red rider"? Where is the Member who will say that he was not attending to his duties on the floor and was absent from the House?

Where is the Member who will say that he did not know what was going on in the House? Where is the Member who will say that he did not avail himself of his privileges to stop a measure he did not like, when he did not object to it, when he did not ask for time to speak against it, when he did not raise his voice against it, when he did not vote against it, and when he did not demand a roll call against it? It would simply be a plea of guilty to neglect of duty.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 3

That BLANTON slipped it through.

It was not "slipped" through by anybody. The assertion that it was "slipped" through is false. The malicious assertion that "BLANTON slipped it through" is mendaciously false. When the House managers in conference were trying to adjust the 114 Senate amendments with the Senate managers, in June 1935, and the Senate managers asserted there would be no bill unless the House agreed to the Senate amendment making the appropriation for so-called character education, I proposed that if the Senate managers would recommend to the Senate the adoption of a proviso preventing communism from being taught and advocated in the schools we would recommend to the House that it adopt the Senate proposal thus amended, and then in said conference I dictated said proviso to our clerk, Mr. Duvall, to wit:

That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism.

And said proviso was drawn up in writing by Mr. Duvall, and copies of same were furnished to the House and Senate managers, and all agreed that recommendation would be made both to the House and Senate that said proviso be adopted as an amendment to said Senate amendment no. 48, but said conferees could make no agreement about same other than they would submit the matter to the House and Senate for adoption or rejection, as both the Senate amendment no. 48 and said amendment thereto were legislation, and the conferees could not put any legislation in the conference report, as agreeing to legislation in a conference report would under the rules vitiate the entire report.

CHAIRMAN CANNON MADE THE MOTION

I have already quoted the proceedings in the House, page 8002, on June 6, 1935, showing the motion made by Chairman CANNON of Missouri, to concur in the Senate amendment no. 48, as amended by adding the "red rider" as a proviso, and that said "red rider" was read to the House by the Clerk from the Speaker's desk, and the House adopted the motion made by Mr. CANNON of Missouri, and by an unanimous vote adopted said "red rider." The unfounded report "that BLANTON slipped it through" was made by irresponsibles, based upon an assertion made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK], who is against the "red rider" and wants it repealed, in a colloquy on the floor which from page 1814 of the RECORD for February 11, 1936, I now quote:

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I was on the floor of this House all the time. About 40 or 50 Members were here, and never before did I hear TOM BLANTON speak in a muffled tone so that no one could know what it was. The Clerk was not understood, because I was here and I would have objected. I know what a point of order is. I know what legislation in an appropriation bill is; that it is improper and subject to a point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, Mr. Speaker, that is all nonsense. TOM BLANTON was not even speaking. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the motion to adopt the rider, and it was read by the Clerk from the desk in front of the Speaker.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Yes. You and Mr. CANNON were right there [pointing].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, is there any way to stop this obstreperousness? [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, that motion to adopt the rider I had the conferees to agree to, stopping communism in the Washington schools, was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who moved to recede from the amendment of the Senate and concur with this anticommunism amendment, which amendment he had the Clerk read aloud to the House. That was Mr. CANNON talking and our Clerk reading. It was Mr. CANNON's motion, not mine.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. When I made the statement, I did not say the gentleman from Texas made the motion, but the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] were there [pointing] and you stood right alongside him, and in muffled tones told him what to do. Mr. CANNON made that motion. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman knows all that, he must have known about the motion to adopt the rider to stop communism. Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, does anybody think for a minute he is going to tell the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] what to do or how to do it? He is the greatest parliamentarian in the United States. He is the author of one of the greatest works on parliamentary precedents that has ever been produced, about a dozen large volumes of which are on the press now.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. We know about that.

Mr. BLANTON. Of course; the statement is ridiculous.

And, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again, that on page 8808 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and on page 796 of the daily Journal, of the House of Representatives for June 6, 1935, it is shown clearly and distinctly that Mr. CANNON of Missouri made the motion that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment no. 48 with an amendment, which was the "red rider", which he, Mr. CANNON, sent to the Clerk's desk and which the Clerk read as follows, to wit:

Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism.

And that the Speaker then put the motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri before the House, and the House agreed to it; and the motion was adopted with not a vote against it; and that then Mr. CANNON of Missouri then moved to reconsider and lay that on the table, which motion carried; and that made the action of the House final on the matter.

THE HOUSE JOURNAL ALSO SHOWS WHAT HAPPENED

The daily Journal of the House of Representatives for June 6, 1935, on page 796, shows the following:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moved that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment no. 48 and concur therein with the following amendment:

Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: *"Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism."*

The motion was agreed to.

A motion by Mr. CANNON of Missouri to reconsider the vote whereby the foregoing motion was agreed to was, on his motion, and by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

Ordered, That the Clerk notify the Senate.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, it is shown by the Journal of the House that BLANTON did not have anything whatever to do with said motion in the House to adopt said "red rider", as the whole matter was handled in the House by Chairman CANNON of Missouri, and his conclusion of the matter was done by the unanimous consent of the House without the voice of a single Member being raised against it.

It is too late now for any disgruntled to squeal. If some Member was not on the floor attending to his official duties while the House was transacting important business it was his own fault, and he has nobody but himself to blame; and he ought not to cry now about spilt milk. He will learn sometime, if he does not know it now, that the leaders of the House who transact the business do not have to go around looking up any indifferent Member to tell him that they are going to transact business in the House. If anyone expects that he never will know what is going on in the House of Representatives.

PRACTICALLY THE IDENTICAL ACTION TAKEN BY SENATE

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, from what I quoted from page 8002 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and from page 796 of the House Journal, that after the House had adopted the motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, and had passed the red rider, preventing the indoctrination of communism in the public schools, the House ordered "that the Clerk notify the Senate" of such action.

Pages 8796 and 8797 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, permanent, shows the following:

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

"That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48 to said bill and concur therein with the following amendment:

"Before the period at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: *"Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the pay-*

ment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate no. 48.

The motion was agreed to.

Then, Mr. Speaker, and not until then, was the red rider made a part of said bill. It had been voted unanimously into the Senate amendment no. 48 by the House. It was then approved, and became a part of the bill, when the Senate voted for it unanimously. And it will be noted that it is stated in the Senate proceedings that the so-called red rider was read to the Senate before the Senate passed it. It was not "BLANTON" handling it in the Senate. It was Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma who moved that the red rider be adopted. "BLANTON" was not even there. "BLANTON" had nothing whatever to do with the action taken in the Senate when it passed it.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, it was maliciously and mendaciously false to assert that "BLANTON slipped it through", when after the House Clerk had read it to the House, the House passed it on the motion of Chairman CANNON of Missouri, and after the Vice President laid it before the Senate, and the Senate clerk read it to the Senate, it was passed by the Senate on the motion of Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma. Then the President signed it. And it became the law of the land on July 1, 1935. It has been the law ever since. And it is the law now. And it was a long time before anybody got a notion into their head to repeal it.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 4

That there was no occasion for its passage.

There was ample occasion. Complaints have been growing and multiplying ever since the Soviet regime took over Russia. These complaints come from substantial, credible fathers and mothers of Washington, from the representatives of citizens' organizations, from the American Legion, from the District of Columbia Public School Association, from the Daughters of the American Revolution, from the ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, from teachers in the schools, and leading officials.

First. The official minutes of the Board of Education show that a teacher in the Western High School, Miss West, was suspended for 1 week for teaching bolshevism while discussing current events in her English class, and that she is still teaching in the schools.

Second. Four years after Dr. Frank W. Ballou became the \$10,000-per-year superintendent of the Washington schools it became necessary for Congress to pass a law to stop communism from being taught by his corps of teachers. I quote the following from page 7796, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1924, being volume 65, part 8, Sixty-eighth Congress:

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. Summers of Washington: Page 33, at the end of line 22, insert: *'Provided, That no part of this sum shall be available for the payment of the salaries of any superintendent, assistant superintendent, director of intermediate instruction, or supervising principal who permits the teaching of partisan politics, disrespect to the Holy Bible, or that ours is an inferior form of government.'*

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not make a point of order to that.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation, and, of course, it is in order.

I think everyone will agree with me that no teaching of this kind should be permitted in the schools of this District nor in the public school of any city or town in any State in the Union.

I have spoken to a number of Members, and it is an exception to find one who does not say that his children have come to him with complaints in regard to one or the other of the points mentioned in this amendment.

In the interest of the highest possible standard of education in this city, and because I believe that the schools here should be as nearly as possible a model for those throughout the country, I think this thing ought to be stopped, and this amendment will have that effect.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Has the gentleman information that such things are going on in the schools which his amendment is intended to reach?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Who will pass upon the question as to whether this is happening or not? Who will be the arbiter?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The school board.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Will not the man who issues or pays these warrants be the one? This being a limitation on this appropriation, will they not pass this question up to the accounting officers of the Government?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. All right.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. In a practical way, I would like to know how that is going to work.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It might be up to the accounting officers. Anyhow, there would be a way then by which one might file a complaint and stop the payment of salaries to anyone who has been permitting this pernicious teaching. It has unquestionably been going on for years and is going on in this present year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LOWREY. Mr. Chairman, may we have it again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will again be reported.

(The amendment was again read.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

That was the first "red rider." The House of Representatives unanimously passed it on May 3, 1924. That was 12 years ago. It prevented teachers in the Washington schools from "teaching partisan politics", from teaching "disrespect to the Holy Bible", and from teaching that "ours is an inferior form of government", all communistic doctrines of Soviet Russia.

Note that Congressman Summers from the House floor then said, on May 3, 1924:

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I have spoken to a number of Members, and it is an exception to find one who does not say that his children have come to him with complaints in regard to one or the other points mentioned in this amendment.

Not a Member denied his statement. He then said it was an exception to find a Member whose children had not complained about such subversive teaching. It is Soviet Russia that is propagating the communistic doctrine of "disrespect to the Holy Bible" and that "ours is an inferior form of government." That is just the kind of doctrine that is embraced in the book *Made in Russia*, which Superintendent Ballou and his Board of Education now have in the schools of Washington.

FIRST "RED RIDER" PASSED IN 1924 BY HOUSE AND SENATE

After passing the first "red rider" in the House on May 3, 1924, Dr. Summers then had to battle Dr. Ballou, who tried to get the Senate to knock it out of the bill. Even at that early date Dr. Ballou raised his pet slogan of "academic freedom", but the Senate passed it, and the President signed the bill, and the first "red rider" became law, but was effective only until July 1, 1925, when it would expire.

SECOND "RED RIDER" PASSED SECOND TIME IN 1925

Again in 1925 Dr. Summers' "red rider" to prevent communism from being taught in the public schools of Washington was placed in the District appropriation bill, and passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President, and became law in force and effect until July 1, 1926.

DR. BALLOU AND COMMUNISTIC HENCHMEN KEPT IT OUT OF NEXT BILL

The hue and cry of "factual instruction" and "academic freedom" was then started by Dr. Ballou and the Washington newspapers. They belittled and ridiculed the law. They belittled and ridiculed every Congressman or Senator who espoused it. They succeeded in keeping it out of the next appropriation bill, and the law expired on July 1, 1926. That is the reason that when the last "red rider" was passed by Congress on June 6, 1935, it was not drawn as a limitation that would expire with the fiscal year, but was drawn as permanent law by using the word "hereafter", so that Congress would not have to pass it again every year.

Third. The Board of Education cannot escape its responsibility, for it knew of its act when it suspended the Western High School teacher for 1 week for teaching communism. It knew of Congressman Summers' charge in 1924, when he passed the first "red rider." It knew of his charges in 1925, when he passed the second "red rider." Instead of cooperating with Congress in its attempt to stamp out communism from the schools, it joined Superintendent Ballou in 1925

and 1926 in trying to repeal the Summers "red rider", and did help Superintendent Ballou to repeal same, and the law expired July 1, 1926.

BOARD OF EDUCATION WHITEWASHED COMMUNISM IN 1928

The Washington Post on April 3, 1938, under its main headline, "Reds Renew Drive as School Board Launches Inquiry", and the subheadline, "Boy of 12 Testifies of Effort to Bring Him Into Fold of Communism", printed the following:

Communistic elements, whose activities in the schools was the subject of inquiry by the Board of Education yesterday, responded to the Board's thrust by renewal of proselytizing campaigns in the schools.

One 12-year-old youngster, who testified before the hearing yesterday, told the Board that yesterday he had been approached in the Central High School by another youth who sought to enlist his interest in communism.

Talk of communism pervaded the whole meeting. There are in the District schools, according to the testimony, two organizations affiliated with the Communist Party. One is the Young Communist League and the other the Young Pioneers. Columbia High School, Macfarland High School, Central High School, and Business High School were mentioned by the witnesses as having been points of Communist activity.

Mr. Henry Gilligan's statement that the Appropriations Committee has not the right "to tell us how to run our schools" was applauded.

It will be noted, Mr. Speaker, that on April 3, 1928, the Washington Post, which is now friendly to communism, and is friendly to Superintendent Ballou, and friendly to the Board of Education, and is against the "red rider", and in favor of the "Sissy bill", which would allow communism to be indoctrinated in the schools, then broadcasted to its readers the fact that the testimony before the Board of Education in 1928 showed that there are in the District schools two organizations affiliated with the Communist Party. Yet, instead of cooperating with Congress in trying to remove communism from the Washington schools, the Board of Education is cooperating with Superintendent Ballou in trying to repeal the "red rider", so that all teachers would then have a free hand to teach communism or any other subversive doctrine they may see fit to teach.

Fourth. The Federation of Citizens' Associations is a combined confederation of 63 different citizens' associations organized and existing in the District of Columbia. They represent, are prepared to, and do speak for the citizenship generally of Washington, D. C. They had the right to demand of Congress the passage of a law to stop communism from being indoctrinated in the schools to their children.

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS REQUESTED "RED RIDER"

It was the people of Washington who asked for the "red rider." Will anyone say that 63 different citizens' associations through their Federation of Citizens' Associations did not have the inherent right to request the "red rider" to prevent communism? On March 16, 1935, the said Federation of Citizens' Associations passed a resolution advocating a rider upon the then pending District of Columbia appropriation bill to disallow an appropriation for so-called character education and to stop communism in the schools. The "red rider" to stop communism and the appropriation bill disallowing any appropriation for so-called character education were passed by both the House and Senate on June 6, 1936. It was in direct response to and in accord with the request of the fathers and mothers of Washington, whose children were being contaminated by the attempt to indoctrinate communism in the schools.

Fifth. The Federation of Citizens' Associations appointed a special committee consisting of Hon. George E. Sullivan, as chairman, he being one of the leading lawyers of Washington; Hon. Harry N. Stull, a vice president of said federation; Mrs. George Corbin and Mrs. Horace J. Phelps, two prominent, high-standing ladies of Washington, to act for said Federation of Citizens' Associations on the elimination of communism from the District of Columbia public schools. The following are resolutions passed by said federation and said special committee relating thereto:

1. Resolution adopted by the federation March 16, 1935, advocating a rider upon the then pending District of Columbia appropriation bill, in view of the disclosure that Dr. Charters (shown to be

on the advisory board of communistic Moscow University summer school) was being employed for character education in the District of Columbia public schools.

2. Resolution adopted by the executive committee November 12, 1935, providing for the creation of this special committee and the taking of steps to eliminate textbooks in the District of Columbia public schools containing communistic propaganda and secure for the pupils instead "a clear and informative definition of communism and its evil and atrocious aims and purposes."

3. Further resolution adopted by the executive committee December 3, 1935, directing this special committee to extend its work to cover periodicals as well as textbooks.

4. Resolution adopted by the federation December 7, 1935, approving and endorsing the aforesaid actions by the executive committee.

5. Resolutions adopted by the federation January 4, 1936, advocating an immediate appeal to Congress to provide "an effective remedy, and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions."

Sixth. The said special committee appointed by said Federation of Citizens' Associations to eliminate communism from the Washington schools was nonpartisan in every respect and embraced one Catholic and three of other religious faiths, and they worked together zealously and harmoniously. I quote the following from their report to the federation:

COMMITTEE REPORT APPROVED AND ADOPTED MARCH 28, 1936, BY FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE VOTING DOWN BY IT OF A PROPOSED SUBSTITUTE MOTION TO ENDORSE THE SISSON REPEAL BILL, H. R. 13375

MARCH 28, 1936.

To the Federation of Citizens' Associations, District of Columbia:

The last report of this special committee, dated January 4, 1936, was approved by the federation, and resolutions were adopted on that date describing "existing conditions" in the public schools of this District as "favorable to subversive, antipatriotic, and communistic propaganda", and expressly declaring that "the recent action of the Board of Education makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States shall be appealed to without delay to provide an effectual remedy and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions." This special committee has made appeal to the Congress as so directed by the federation, the subject matter being presented to the Senate and House District Committees and also to the House Appropriations Committee.

The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the House Appropriations Committee conducted a thorough investigation into this subject matter. The entire subcommittee of five members participated actively in the investigation, and went to original sources for their data. Books and magazines, etc., in use with pupils in the public schools were carefully studied by said subcommittee, with such books, magazines, etc., actually before them for weeks; and the printed hearings show that the subcommittee found an abundance of antipatriotic and procommunistic matter, and also matter tending to seriously affect and undermine fundamental morals of the pupils in the matter of sexual relations. The destruction of sexual morality is well known, of course, to be one of the aims and purposes of communism. The Superintendent of Schools, the head of the history department in the high schools, and the editor of Scholastic magazine were heard before said subcommittee and disclosed no possible excuse or justification for the conditions against which this federation has complained, and which are now admitted to have been going on for a number of years.

Your special committee has carefully considered all of the foregoing and recommends that the federation deal specifically with the following issues which have been raised.

1. So-called academic freedom: We recommend that the federation reject as fundamentally unsound the proposition advanced by Congressman Sisson and by the Board of Education that it is an invasion of the rights of the school authorities for Congress to direct, regulate, or control any features of the curriculum in the public schools. No one has been able to suggest wherein this proposition has any foundation in American institutions; exclusive legislation for the District of Columbia is vested by the Constitution in the Congress, and the school authorities are public servants obligated to respect and obey such legislation. It should be noted in this connection that as early as 1886 (act of May 20, 1886 (24 Stat. L. 69)), Congress upheld its jurisdiction, not only in the public schools of the District of Columbia but in schools everywhere else subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, by expressly requiring "the nature of alcoholic drinks and narcotics, and special instruction as to their effects upon the human system" to be taught, and to require removal from office of anyone failing or neglecting to comply with such requirement.

2. Legislation requiring pupils to be acquainted with evil aims and effects of communism and other un-American doctrines: Since Congress has the undoubted power to require pupils to be acquainted with the harmful effects of alcohol and narcotics, which affect the individual only directly, and the Nation indirectly, how can anyone seriously question the power of Congress to require that pupils in the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be made acquainted with the evil aims and effects of communism

and other un-American doctrines, which affect both the Nation and the individual directly? This special committee recommends that the federation advocate the immediate passage of legislation to this effect, with means for enforcement similar to what is provided for in the aforesaid act of 1886, and with specific requirement that all such subversive doctrines be expressly denounced to the pupils in all textbooks or other data or explanation used with the pupils referring to such doctrines. This is in accord with the uniform position taken by this federation at all times. Not only has the federation at no time objected to pupils in the public schools being made so acquainted but it has insisted at all times upon the pupils being made so acquainted for their own protection; in other words, that the truth, and not half truths, shall be told the pupils about and against communism and that it is inherently impossible to tell them the truth about communism without teaching against communism and denouncing it as a world revolution conspiracy seeking destruction by force and violence of all nations and practically every vestige of civilization.

As a matter of fact, the clause against communism in the aforesaid District of Columbia appropriation bill of June 14, 1935, does not require any monthly or other affidavits; and it was not until December 1, 1935, that the Comptroller General decided to make such requirement, and then only because it became apparent that the school authorities would not accede to the reasonable demand of Congress (inherently necessary) that no teaching about communism could take place which did not actually teach against and denounce it.

GEO. E. SULLIVAN, Chairman,
HARRY N. STULL,
MRS. GEORGE CORBIN,
MRS. HORACE J. PHELPS,

Special Committee on Elimination of Communistic
Matter from District of Columbia Public Schools.

HOW CAN ANY HONEST, TRUTHFUL PERSON SAY THAT THERE WAS NO OCCASION FOR PASSING THE "RED RIDER"?

When the Federation of Citizens Associations adopted the foregoing report of its special committee to eliminate communism, it was the people of Washington speaking. It was the fathers and mothers whose children were involved. It was the taxpayers who pay the expenses of the public schools here. They had a right to be heard. They had a right to protect their children. They had the right on March 16, 1935, to request Congress to pass the "red rider." They had the right to stand behind their "red rider" after it was passed. They had the right to denounce the "sissy bill" that would allow communism in their schools.

Seventh. The District of Columbia Public School Association is a federation of 97 different organizations and embraces 28 different citizens' associations in the District of Columbia. Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries is its president. General Fries did valiant service in France during the World War, and was in charge of our Chemical Warfare Service there. He has been at the head of the American Legion here in Washington for a number of years. His association, without a dissenting vote, passed the following:

Resolution adopted unanimously by the District of Columbia Public School Association April 1, 1936

Be it resolved by the District of Columbia Public School Association, That they are opposed to the appropriation for any further money for the so-called character-education experiment in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and they urge that any funds that might be available for such character-education experiment be used to employ additional teachers in the various grades where they are seriously needed.

AMOS A. FRIES,

President of the District of Columbia Public School Association.

Eighth. I quote the following from the evidence of Gen. Amos A. Fries before the Senate subcommittee:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. AMOS A. FRIES

Mr. Chairman, I am submitting this statement as president of the Public School Association of the District of Columbia, and in the name and on behalf of that association, an association of groups of civic, fraternal, business, and citizens already existing under other titles, but who are particularly interested in the public schools of the District. There are over 90 of these citizens' groups in the association. The various groups are taxpayers, citizens of the District of Columbia, and some of the teachers themselves. The great majority of them have now, or have had, children in the public schools, and are most concerned with the proper teaching and training of their children.

They pay the taxes that provides the money to build the school-houses, maintain the grounds and buildings, pay the teachers, and then feed, clothe, and care for the children. These parents feel that they are the ones to say what shall be taught their children and what shall not be taught them, and not the teachers. They feel that the teacher who is unwilling to take this view of the position of the parents is not fitted to teach and should get out of the public schools.

These parents strenuously object to ill-considered and wholesale experiments being practiced on their children, just because some professors or superintendents want to try out their particular ideas of methods of teaching, or social philosophies, economic theories, or even trying to teach a form of government foreign to that of the United States.

The District of Columbia Public School Association is vigorously opposed to the teaching of communism in the schools, or to the repeal of the law against teaching or advocating communism in the schools, unless and until a law is passed which will make mandatory the denunciation of the ideas, philosophy, and actual working of Communist governments, whenever the subject of communism is touched upon by any teacher in the public schools of the District.

The association is equally opposed to the appropriation of any more money for the so-called character-education experiment. It believes that the experiment is an absolute waste of the taxpayers' money and that certain of the schemes being carried out are actually detrimental to the children's future. It is to prepare our children for citizenship in the "new social order", but what that is Dr. Ballou says he does not know himself.

Ninth. The following is quoted from the testimony of Hon. George E. Sullivan, given before our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

STATEMENT OF GEORGE E. SULLIVAN, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS ON ELIMINATING ANTI-PATRIOTIC AND SUBVERSIVE MATTER FROM PUBLIC SCHOOLS

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Sullivan, do you appear in a representative capacity?

MR. SULLIVAN. I do. I appear for the Federation of Citizens' Associations as chairman of their special committee on eliminating anti-patriotic and other subversive matter from the District of Columbia public schools.

MR. BLANTON. You are the duly authorized representative of the Federated Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia?

MR. SULLIVAN. I am.

MR. BLANTON. How many associations are federated in your organization?

MR. SULLIVAN. There are between 60 and 65 different organizations, each of which has two delegates to the assembly of the federation, which is our deliberative body.

MR. BLANTON. They have delegated to you, these sixty-odd associations, the authority to act for them at this meeting?

MR. SULLIVAN. That is correct.

MR. BLANTON. And you appear for them?

MR. SULLIVAN. I do.

MR. BLANTON. And you speak for them?

MR. SULLIVAN. I do.

MR. BLANTON. And with authority from them?

MR. SULLIVAN. Yes.

MR. BLANTON. Are you a member of the bar association here?

MR. SULLIVAN. I have been a member of the board of directors, and have been a member of the bar association since 1902.

MR. BLANTON. What is your age?

MR. SULLIVAN. I will be 55 this year.

MR. BLANTON. You may proceed.

MR. SULLIVAN. In order to save the time of the committee, as most of the matter I have to present is authentic documentary matter, I have prepared a memorandum here and, if it is agreeable to the committee, in order to save time, and in the interest of accuracy, I will read it, as follows, to wit:

As chairman of the special committee of the Federation of Citizens' Associations, District of Columbia, on eliminating anti-patriotic and subversive matter from the public schools, I am authorized and directed to acquaint the Congress with conditions of long duration, which have been recently uncovered, and for the creation and continuance of which the superintendent of schools and the Board of Education are directly responsible. The seriousness of the matter cannot be gainsaid, as will appear from resolutions adopted by this federation January 4, 1936, declaring that—

"The recent action of the Board of Education makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States shall be appealed to without delay to provide an effectual remedy and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions."

The public-school system has never had a more alert or faithful supporter than this federation, which always advocates and urges entirely adequate provision for the best school facilities. This federation believes the public-school system was devised and intended as the most important bulwark of patriotism and good citizenship, and that the public-school system should ever be preserved and maintained as such, and not be permitted to be used for contrary purposes, to impair or destroy patriotism and good citizenship.

This federation has always been most friendly to the Board of Education, and the superintendent of schools, Dr. Frank W. Ballou, and has extended its aid and cooperation to them on innumerable occasions. This federation believes in the patriotism and loyalty of the rank and file of the teachers generally in the District of Columbia public schools. Consequently, it was inconceivable to this federation, until most startling recent developments, that the District of Columbia public schools could possibly have become perverted into a means for subtly undermining patriotism and

love of country, so as to create a fertile field for sowing the seeds of communism, and then proceeding to actually sow such seeds in the public schools. But we have been shocked to find what was considered inconceivable is an awful reality. Moreover, the methods used to accomplish it have been so clever as to practically defy analysis and detection by persons outside the schools, and to also carry the teachers along in a maelstrom, leaving the teachers helpless to resist or expose what is imposed upon them, without endangering the loss of their positions.

COMMUNISM, SOMETIMES CALLED "MARXIAN COMMUNISM", IS NOT A LEGITIMATE SOCIAL SCIENCE BUT A HYPOCRITICAL CONSPIRACY TO DESTROY ALL CIVILIZATION AND TO ESTABLISH IN ITS STEAD A WORLD-WIDE AUTOCRATIC BARBARISM

Since many intelligent persons, even in high official positions, do not appear to have acquainted themselves with the real nature and seriousness of communism, it is, perhaps, appropriate, by way of introduction to what is to follow, to give briefly, some really informative and authentic data concerning it.

Communism and Russia are by no means synonymous. Russia merely occupies the unfortunate position of being communism's first victim. Communism is synonymous with world revolution, and seeks the destruction of all nations, including abolition of patriotism, religion, marriage, the family, private property, and all political and civil liberties, and the establishment of a world-wide dictatorship of the so-called proletariat, which is an autocratic self-constituted dictatorship by a small group of self-perpetuating revolutionists. (See Rept. No. 2290, House of Representatives, 71st Cong., 3d sess.) Said report quotes admissions under oath by William Z. Foster, twice candidate of the Communist Party for President of the United States, as follows:

"Our party considers religion to be the opium of the people, as Karl Marx has stated, and we carry on propaganda for the liquidation of these prejudices amongst the workers (p. 10).

"As I stated before, workers who would be so imbued with religious superstitions that they would be married in a church would be of no value to the Communist Party.

"Q. And the same thing would happen to them in this country that happens to them in Russia?

"A. Of course (p. 10).

"Q. Do the Communists in this country advocate world revolution?

"A. Yes; the Communists in this country realize that America is connected up with the whole world system, and the capitalist system displays the same characteristics everywhere—everywhere it makes for the misery and exploitation of the workers—and it must be abolished, not only on an American scale but on a world scale (p. 11).

"Q. Just what is the Third International?

"A. The Communist International is the world party of the Communist movement.

"Q. Is the Communist Party of the United States connected with it?

"A. It is.

"Q. In what way?

"A. It is the American section (p. 11).

"The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag, and that is the red flag. That is the flag of the proletarian revolution (p. 12)."

More recently the Communists have become so bold that they are publicly proclaiming some of their outrageous aims and purposes, previously concealed and disavowed. As late as April 15, 1932, George S. Counts (who is carried in printed literature of communistic Moscow University for the summer session of 1935 as a member of said university's national advisory council) published a book, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* There was a fifth printing of said book in October 1935. In said book he lays down the following as texts for teachers:

"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest, is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school, they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation (pp. 28-29).

"The conscious and deliberate achievement of democracy under novel circumstances is the task of our generation.

"Democracy, of course, should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage (p. 40).

"Finally, be prepared as a last resort, in either the defense or the realization of this purpose, to follow the method of revolution (pp. 41-42)."

It will be observed that this communistically connected gentleman, Counts, is so clever with the use of language that these outrageously subversive texts, addressed to teachers, do not so much as mention the word "communism" or make direct reference to Soviet Russia in such quoted texts. Yet is very plain from the language used—even aside from his connection with communistic Moscow University—that he is advocating resort to revolution as a final means for overthrowing our Nation, but recommending that the teachers be first used to make the coming generation believe that our Republic should be discarded and something accepted in its stead (obviously, the dictatorship of the proletariat) not identified with the Federal Constitution nor with the popular election of officials nor with the practice of universal suffrage.

The evil aims and purposes of communism, namely, the destruction of our Republic, and also of civilized society, and the rearing in its stead of a ruthless autocracy, with liberty, morality, and decency discarded, cannot be ignored by honest-minded persons.

SUPPOSED "ACADEMIC FREEDOM" IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

The Communists maintain more than 300 schools in the United States, where revolution, strike tactics, and hatred to our Government and its institutions are taught. A list of such Communist schools is given on page 25 of Extracts from Public Hearings Before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, Seventy-third Congress, second session, December 29, 1934. The Communists in this country say they owe no allegiance to our Nation, its Constitution, or its flag, yet they claim the right to conduct such Communist schools as a part of supposed "academic freedom." Plainly, they do not have the right to any such "academic freedom", to deceive and mislead our youth. They are enjoying something to which they have no right and which the public authorities are derelict in not suppressing.

Since communism is primarily an antireligious and anticivilization creed, it is difficult to understand why, under the guise of "academic freedom", it is entitled to receive any attention in the public schools as a subject for study, even if communism's inherent subversiveness and hypocrisy be disregarded. It would, manifestly, be most unfair to have the pupils study matter misrepresenting and denouncing all religions, as communism does, when on refutation of such misrepresentation and denouncement of all religions would be possible, since discussion of any religious creed in the public schools is absolutely precluded.

Every loyal American citizen recognizes that patriotism is inseparable from national consciousness. Consequently, any attempt in the public schools to glorify, or even dignify, subversive internationalism, or to minimize the importance of national existence, national honor, or patriotism, or to induce or cultivate in the pupils skepticism regarding any of the last-named, in the interest of so-called scientific history, or for any other reason, is plainly pernicious and reprehensible.

THE EMPLOYMENT AND RETENTION OF DR. W. W. CHARTERS IN CONNECTION WITH CHARACTER EDUCATION IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, NOTWITHSTANDING DR. CHARTERS' COMMUNISTIC MOSCOW UNIVERSITY, SINCE DECEMBER 1933

This federation became genuinely alarmed at such startling condition of affairs, and consequently on March 16, 1935, adopted a resolution urging the insertion in the then pending District of Columbia appropriation bill of a special provision prohibiting payment of any money appropriated for the public schools [reading]: "Any advocate of communism or other un-American doctrine or to any organization or agency advocating such doctrine."

The District of Columbia appropriation bill, as finally passed June 14, 1935, contained a special provision or prohibition as follows [reading]: "Provided, That hereafter no part of any appropriation for the public schools shall be available for the payment of the salary of any person teaching or advocating communism."

CONDITIONS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS ON JUNE 14, 1935, WHEN THE RIDER AGAINST COMMUNISM WAS ADOPTED

The federation's alarm in March 1935, due to the employment and retention of Dr. Charters, whose connection with communistic Moscow University had been shown, suggested to it the necessity for alertness and caution as to what might occur in the public schools; but the federation was not led to even suspect that actual wrongdoing of any kind was then going on in the District of Columbia public schools.

It was not until November 1935 that this federation first learned of any actual wrongdoing going on in the public schools detrimental to the pupils, the citizenship generally, and our Nation. Such conditions, discovered commencing in and since November 1935, are shown to have existed for some years past, and to have been introduced on the recommendation of the superintendent of schools with the approval of the Board of Education. Earlier discovery would likely have been made, had it not been for assurances by Dr. Ballou and Dr. Charters that pupils were merely being taught how to think—not what to think.

TEXTBOOK MODERN HISTORY, BY CARL BECKER, IN USE IN WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS SINCE FEBRUARY 1, 1933

The following brief quotations, with page references to enable consideration thereof in their exact setting, will make plain the presence of inexcusable objectionable matter in said textbook:

"The essence of Marx's scientific socialism is this: The workers are at present enslaved to the capitalists; but the stars in their courses, rather than the feeble wills of men, are bringing about their liberation. What Marx gave the workers was a new philosophy—religion—a religion to console them in their present distress, a philosophy pointing out the good time coming (pp. 535-536).

"Soviet Russia: How Nicolai Lenin made good the prophecies of Karl Marx by establishing the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat' (p. 790, 1933 ed.; p. 779, 1935 ed.).

"Many great leaders in the crusade for human freedom have been like that. They have united a passionate sympathy for the poor and oppressed with a passionate hatred for those whom they held responsible for poverty and oppression.

"Lenin was a disciple of Karl Marx (p. 791, 1933 ed.; p. 780, 1935 ed.).

"The 'gentle and smiling' Lenin was the Lenin who felt a profound sympathy with the poverty and oppression under which the

Russian people lived and had lived for centuries. The 'hard and criminal' Lenin was the Lenin who never doubted that the tsars and landed aristocrats and idle rich were responsible for this poverty and oppression, or that the most ferocious methods were necessary and justified in order to establish the rights of the people. This passionate faith in a doctrine is the secret of Lenin (p. 791, 1933 ed.; p. 781, 1935 ed.).

"By 1930 the output of Russian industries was on the whole as great as, and in some of the government-owned industries greater than, before the war.

"With the return of economic prosperity the Soviet Government became every year more popular, and in 1928 it felt strong enough to take another step forward toward the nationalization of the land (p. 799, 1933 ed.; p. 788, 1935 ed.).

"The Russian revolution aims to effect a complete transformation of society—the establishment of a Communist economic regime and the acceptance of a Communist philosophy of life. This is why it is, of all the events of our time, the most interesting and perhaps the most important (p. 805, 1933 ed.; p. 794, 1935 ed.)."

Professor Becker's record as favoring communism was well known before his book *Modern History* was adopted as a textbook for the District of Columbia schools. In 1920 he had published a book, *The United States, an Experiment in Democracy*, stating that immigrants—"describe America as they have found it—a country dominated by capitalists, a sordid bourgeois society, without ideals, a land of 'dollar chasers' where wealth controls the Government and exploits the people" (p. 234).

And as late as 1932 Professor Becker had published another book, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth Century Philosophers*, lauding Marxian communism as "a new religion" (p. 161), asserting it to be "the duty of common men" to "adjust themselves" to it (p. 162), and then paying the following tribute to communism in Russia:

"And now, in our day, the first act in the social revolution, accompanied and sustained by the Communist faith, has just been staged in Russia (p. 163)."

TEXTBOOK, CHANGING CIVILIZATIONS IN THE MODERN WORLD, BY HAROLD RUGG, APPROVED IN WASHINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOL DOCUMENT NO. 2, 1933, FOR "SLOW-GOING PUPILS" IN JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

This book contains praise of communism for its supposed accomplishments in Russia, as a few quotations therefrom will make manifest:

"Russia since her revolution: In general the standard of living today is about the same as in 1913. In this respect the recovery of Russia since the World War has about equaled that of Germany, France, and Great Britain (p. 399).

"Though wages are low, the Russian people have many advantages that they lacked before the revolution: * * * There are other important things besides wages and costs to be considered in judging the standard of living of a people; schools, medical help, and amusements are among these. In Russia all these things are free to factory workers and peasants. * * *

"We must remember all these things when we think of the standard of living of the Russians (p. 409)."

WEEKLY MAGAZINE SCHOLASTIC, SOMETIMES STYLED "THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL WEEKLY", AND AT OTHER TIMES "THE NATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL WEEKLY", USED AS A STUDY MAGAZINE IN WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS SINCE AS EARLY AS DECEMBER 1932, AND EXPRESSLY APPROVED ON PAGE 4 OF WASHINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOL DOCUMENT NO. 2, 1933

The social studies editor of this study magazine is the same Harold Rugg heretofore mentioned. Some quotations from a number of issues of said magazine will show its character and purpose.

"He (Santa Claus) was only a pretty fairy tale that our elders, for some unaccountable reason, had palmed off on us. They thought it made us happier.

"The shock of that disappointment is so long ago now that we can hardly remember. But since we got into high school, some other Santa Clauses have been bowled over. One gets punctured every day or two.

"The national flower, says one headline writer, has become the razzberry.

"The mood of disillusionment has indeed settled over the present generation.

"A journalist who traveled the country over and talked with hundreds of ordinary obscure men and women in all walks of life came back with a profound impression that the American people have no national faith." (From editorial on p. 1 of *Scholastic* magazine of Dec. 17, 1932.)

"You want to know what is the best kind of government, the best economic system, the best type of school. You want to know how to stop war and racial intolerance.

"If you will help us, you shall know these things, and the truth shall make you free." (From editorial on p. 1 of *Scholastic* magazine of Sept. 23, 1933.)

"Scholastic does not and will not attempt to indoctrinate its readers with specific, unalterable beliefs. Nevertheless, its editors have certain considered convictions as to society which they have no apologies for presenting to students as powerfully as they can." (From editorial on p. 1 of *Scholastic* magazine of Dec. 9, 1933.)

"Today 6,000,000 young Russians in the Communist Youth Association are helping to build a new social order. Here is the war psychology of dramatic action which is so dear to youth, set to the great building tasks of business. Stalin speaks of 'science as a fortress which must be carried by youth', etc." (p. 16 of *Scholastic* magazine of Dec. 16, 1933).

"For 100 years the productivity of the civilized world increased about 3 percent each year, perhaps a little, though not much, faster in the United States. Russia proposed to increase hers 20 times as fast.

"But Russian planners do not stop short with material things. They promise to increase the number of students in their country about 50 percent and reduce illiteracy by requiring every child to attend school at least 7 years.

"Can they do it? On the basis of past accomplishments, the answer is 'yes.'" (P. 21 of Scholastic magazine of Jan. 20, 1934.)

"The older transients, it is true, resist communism. They have a mental hold-over of war psychology, the anti-red drives of Palmer, and a belief in the American success story. For boys and girls communism offers school, hope, and adventure." (P. 12 of Scholastic magazine of Oct. 6, 1934, quoting chapter stated to be taken from new book, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*.)

"Here, in rigid logic, he examines such popular beliefs as 'national honor', 'patriotism', 'security'—and exposes their childishness and hypocrisy." (Editorial comment in heavy type, p. 7 of Scholastic magazine of Nov. 10, 1934, extolling the author of a recent book featured in said issue.)

"Men fight for the glory and honor of the fatherland, the motherland, for right against might, for the king and the flag, for the women and children. Not the most iron discipline, not the most urgent necessity for new markets or coal fields can keep armies from crumbling away once the romantic appeal is discovered to be a tricky lie, once the last glimmer of chivalry has vanished." (P. 12 of article appearing in Scholastic magazine of Nov. 9, 1935.)

These precise dates of issues and page references are given in order that the quoted matter may be readily examined in its exact setting, so as to preclude any serious claim that anything has been "lifted" out of its context. Moreover, the quoted matter is so plainly "poisonous" as affecting students of impressionable and inquisitive age, that it cannot possibly be defended under a claim that Scholastic is merely attempting to give the pros and cons on controversial questions.

National existence, national honor, patriotism, and 100-percent Americanism (to the utter exclusion of that subversive and pernicious thing called communism) cannot be recognized as constituting controversial or two-sided questions in the public schools of this Republic, whatever may be the situation in Moscow. Consequently, the aforesaid "poisonous" matter cannot be justified or condoned by any amount of nonpoisonous matter supplied either before, after, or at the same time with such "poisonous" matter; any more than a nurse could justify administering poison to a patient by showing that she also gave the patient some nonpoisonous and wholesome food, or even showing that she gave the patient an antidote before, after, or along with the poison. The sterling loyalty and patriotism of our youth must be given no dose of poison, however small, nor can anyone justify creating or inducing skepticism or doubt in our youth about such matters.

The efforts of Scholastic to create at least a condition of skepticism or doubt in the minds of high-school students regarding patriotism and our Republic, as compared with communism and Soviet Russia, are further manifested by the manner in which the editors of Scholastic treat communications from students with respect thereto. In issue of February 16, 1933, page 30, Scholastic carried, in the Student Forum column, a letter from a student which asserted:

"(1) The average high-school student has intelligence to deduct the difference between opinions that he thinks are for the good of the Nation and terrorism.

"(2) Communism does not seek to destroy, but to uphold the rights of the people."

Judge Sullivan spent much time gathering this data, and I ask my colleagues to consider it carefully. I quote him further:

No editorial comment was added by Scholastic to direct attention to the true facts, namely, that communism seeks the overthrow of all nations, and of practically every element of civilization. However, when Scholastic carried, in its issue of November 18, 1933, page 30, a letter from another student, who stated:

"The only thing I dislike is your attitude concerning socialism and communism. You mention pamphlets written by Socialists and Communists and oftentimes hint for these evils in your columns. What can be your reason? Are you trying to make the students form the opinion that socialism and communism will work after its undoubted failure in Russia?"

The insertion of such student's letter was followed by editorial comment, saying:

"Scholastic suggests only that students investigate these and other ideas before they make up their minds whether or not to condemn them. For instance, investigation would show that communism in Russia, while it has not been a wholesale success, is hardly an 'undoubted failure.'"

Again, when Scholastic published, in its issue of January 13, 1934, page 26, a complaint received from Don Andrus, then a student in Western High School, Washington, D. C. (and who was colonel of the Washington High School Cadets), the publication of his letter was made under the sarcastic label "The Red Menace Again." Said complaint by Don Andrus asserted:

"Scholastic is a dangerous magazine. It is dangerous because of its communistic ideas and notions. Although the magazine is supposed to be unbiased, little things here and there reveal its communistic nature."

TEXTBOOK, HISTORY OF EUROPE: OUR OWN TIMES, BY JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON AND CHARLES A. BEARD, USED IN WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS FOR SEVERAL YEARS

The following quotations from said book reveal the inexcusably objectionable matter contained in it:

"447. Karl Marx: The great teacher of this modern doctrine of socialism was Karl Marx, a German writer, who lived most of his life in London. He was a learned man, trained in philosophy and political economy, and he came to the conclusion, from a study of history, that just as the middle class or capitalists had replaced feudal nobles, so the working class would replace the capitalists in the future. By the working class he meant those who depend upon their work for a living. The introduction of the factory system had reduced the vast majority of artisans to a position in which the capitalist was able to dictate the condition upon which this work should be done. Marx, in an eloquent appeal to them in 1847, called upon the members of this 'proletariat' 'who have nothing to lose but their chains', to rise and seize the means of production themselves. This appeal had almost no effect at the time, but it has been an inspiration to later generations of Socialists and is frequently quoted by them. Modern, or 'Marxian', socialism is therefore a movement of the working class (p. 245).

"448. Socialism an international movement: There is one other important element in socialism. It is international. It regards the cause of workers in different countries as a common cause against a common oppressor—the capitalists (p. 245)."

There is also a chapter in said book commencing on page 611 entitled "Russian Communism", which gives it an air of respectability by failing to set forth its evil aims, purposes, and consequences.

TEXTBOOK, MODERN WORLD SETTING FOR AMERICAN HISTORY, BY GEORGE J. JONES AND EMILY F. SLEMAN, IN USE IN WASHINGTON HIGH SCHOOLS FOR SEVERAL YEARS

This book devotes a special and separate chapter to Karl Marx (pp. 102-106). It is thus plainly indicated or suggested to the pupils that Marxian communism is a part of the modern world setting for American history, instead of the pupils being acquainted with the fact that Marxian communism is a subversive and hypocritical conspiracy to destroy all civilization.

TEXTBOOK, EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION AND POLITICS SINCE 1815, BY ERIK ACHON, ADOPTED JANUARY 16, 1935, FOR THE TEACHERS' COLLEGES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

This book contains an extensive chapter, commencing on page 483, chapter XVII, Bolshevik Russia, several quotations from which will show its character and purposes. On page 532, Soviet Russia is described as having been built with Lenin's "own hands", adding:

"On that supreme achievement, in the last analysis, his immortality depends; and so long as it endures, Lenin can never die.

"Whom shall the students of world history find to compare with him? Alexander and Caesar, by contrast, are puny figures, Louis XIV likewise."

On page 539 it is stated:

"So far as the new social order is concerned, the exploitation of man by man has been eliminated."

The chapter on Bolshevik Russia concludes on page 540 with this final sentence:

"If Russia becomes the greatest power in the world—and there is better than an even chance that she will—what then? Lenin declared that capitalism and bolshevism cannot exist side by side. Can he, who was so often right, have been entirely mistaken in this respect?"

METHOD BOOK FOR TEACHERS, A CHARTER FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES, BY CHARLES A. BEARD

Bulletins of instructions to teachers in history and the social sciences, issued by George J. Jones, head of the department of history in the Washington high schools, have commended this book as giving a scholarly presentation of general objectives. (See p. 2, lines 14-17, of teachers' instruction bulletin, Purposeful Teaching; also p. 2 of teachers' instruction bulletin, Teacher Training in Service.) A reading of said book discloses it to be indefensible and pernicious, insofar as its use in the public schools is concerned. It plainly suggests to the teachers that communism is a legitimate subject of social science for teaching in the public schools, and also that communism ought not to be denounced in the course of such teaching (pp. 44-45), the following ironical statement appearing on page 45:

"In some communities supposed to be enlightened teachers are forbidden to discuss Russia without denouncing her form of government and system of economy."

Said method book adds, on pages 55-56:

"If it be urged that the teacher of social studies should have nothing to do with ideas so controversial in nature, but must stick to facts, an invincible answer is forthcoming. Since all the facts cannot be assembled and presented in any scheme of instruction, a selection must be made, and in the arrangement, since some numerical order is necessary, emphasis cannot be avoided. Every statesman, every judge, every informed citizen who acts on something more than prejudice has in mind a more or less logical picture of an ideal social order to be preserved or realized; and in concrete cases of controversy throws his weight on the one side or the other in accordance with his mental picture. The teacher of social science can only escape presenting the necessity

of choice in social affairs by fleeing from the world of reality to a land of abstraction. If this is the alternative, then civic instruction might as well be taken out of the schools."

The proposition thus advanced clearly demonstrates the impropriety and indefensibility of the employment and retention of the communistically connected gentleman, Dr. W. W. Charters, to guide or direct the character-education experiment in the District of Columbia schools. This impropriety is aggravated when it is learned, as it now is, from page 5 of teachers' instruction bulletin, Character Education Through History, issued by the head of the history department of Washington high schools, that character education in the District of Columbia schools is not intended to teach morals as generally understood but rather to make the teaching of the social sciences the central feature of character education. In lines 4-6 of page 5 of said bulletin it is asserted: "Character building, it would seem, should be a vital aim of all teachers in the social studies. The social sciences have the center of the field for this kind of work."

It is noteworthy in this same connection that the other communistically connected gentleman, George S. Counts, heretofore mentioned, who wrote the aforesaid pernicious book *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* is the editor of the magazine *The Social Frontier*, and on the executive board of another magazine, *The Social Studies*, both of which magazines have been used in the District of Columbia public schools for a number of years. If character building in the public schools is to be molded a la Moscow, let us eliminate it altogether. Nothing short of 100 percent Americanism, without confusion or deviation of any kind, can be tolerated in the teaching curriculum of the public school.

METHOD BOOK FOR TEACHERS' CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF COMMISSION ON THE SOCIAL STUDIES, AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

This book was endorsed for use by teachers in Washington high schools on page 3 of teachers' instruction, bulletin *Teacher Training in Service*, issued by George J. Jones, head of department of history, Washington high schools, and was more recently, namely, on June 5, 1935, expressly approved for such use by the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the superintendent of schools. This book expressly refers to, adopts, and supplements the previously named book, *A Charter for the Social Studies*, which is described as part I of the report of the commission on the social studies. The two outstanding members of said commission were the same George S. Counts and Charles A. Beard, already mentioned. As a matter of fact, said report of said commission expressly included as part IX, teachers' method book, *The Social Foundations of Education*, by said George S. Counts, in which it was asserted on page 27 that "the Federal Constitution with its system of checks and balances represents a deep distrust of popular rule."

Dr. W. W. Charters, who has also been heretofore mentioned, is commended on page 150 of this last-named method book for assistance in the preliminary stages of the commission's work. Dr. Frank W. Ballou is stated on page 152 of said book to have served as a member of said commission and been its secretary throughout the 5-year period of its work (from January 1929 to December 1933). Dr. Ballou refrained from affixing his formal signature to said book and was careful to have the book say he declined to sign, though he did nothing to keep it from being endorsed for use by teachers in the Washington high schools. In fact, Dr. Ballou himself recommended the action which the Board of Education took on June 5, 1935, approving the entire report of said commission on the social sciences for methods for teachers. (See Minutes of Board of Education of June 5, 1935.) Moreover, the document which Dr. Ballou then recommended and which said board approved expressly listed (on p. 10) Karl Marx as a subject for study by seventh-grade pupils under the general heading *The Industrial Revolution*, with express suggestion as to—

- (1) His (Marx's) sympathy for the poor.
- (2) His originality in thinking out a plan."

It is interesting, in this connection, to note, from article carried in the *Evening Star* of January 3, 1936, that an enthusiastic supporter of communistic teaching as a subject of social science in colleges, namely, Dr. Warren Reed West, professor of political science and assistant dean of George Washington School of Government, was careful to point out, in his public address on this subject, which was then being reported, "that the teaching of political theory to high-school boys and girls is perhaps a waste of time, because it is not adapted to the immature mind."

A fortiori, the teaching of political theory is not adapted to seventh-grade pupils, as is now being attempted in the District of Columbia public schools, with the special featuring of Karl Marx to such immature pupils.

While the Federal Constitution provides for its amendment, it does not vest such power, directly or indirectly, in graded or high-school pupils, nor in teachers, superintendents of schools, or boards of education in the public-school system, all of which officials are required to take an oath to support the Federal Constitution as it now is, and until it has been amended through regular recourse to the people in the manner provided for in the Constitution. Consequently, the public schools cannot be legitimately used to sow discontent or dissatisfaction, or to cultivate skepticism, on the part of pupils as to any part of the Federal Constitution.

The aforesaid teachers' method book, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, constituting the last volume of said report of said commission on the social studies, is so ingeniously written that a

very careful study of it is required in order to grasp the full extent of its perniciousness when applied to public schools. A few extracts therefrom, however, may be enlightening:

"Within the limits of an economy marked by integration and interdependence, many possibilities, many roads stand open before education. The making of choices, by either evasion or positive action, also cannot be avoided in the development of an educational program (p. 37)."

"The teacher seldom dares to introduce his pupils to the truth about American society and the forces that drive it onward (pp. 75-6)."

"In comparison with the social-science teacher in the more advanced European countries, the American teacher is poorly trained (p. 76)."

At page 133 of said book, it is asserted that teachers in the public schools should be protected against ignorant majorities, thus pointedly suggesting that teachers should assume the role of public masters, rather than public servants.

LITERATURE TO UNDERMINE THE MORALS AND CHARACTER OF PUPILS

Every informed person is aware that the first step in Communist technique is the undermining of the morals of the youth, and thereby making their subjugation easy. This is the real reason why the Communists wish to destroy all thought of God, religion, and morals, under the pretense of giving greater freedom to youth.

Although Dr. Ballou has made public only a few of the complaints received by him from parents of pupils, it now appears from those few which have been made public that the public schools have been actually utilized to undermine morals of the pupils. On December 20, 1932, Mr. Thomas W. Brahany complained to Dr. Ballou about his 15-year old daughter being required by her teacher to write a summary of a sordid Negro sex story, *A Proud Fellow*, which had appeared in the December 17, 1932, issue of the aforesaid objectionable magazine *Scholastic*. In his reply of February 7, 1933, Dr. Ballou admitted the story itself to be one which high-school pupils should not be called upon to read, but ignored the fact that the teacher had singled out the objectionable story for summary by the pupils, and undertook to pay a compliment to *Scholastic* magazine as being carefully edited. On January 15, 1933, Dr. E. M. Ellison, complained about a history teacher having assigned to his 15-year old daughter for reading a sexually enticing fiction story of prostitution in Asia entitled "*Good Earth*", written by Mrs. Pearl S. Buck.

In his reply of February 7, 1933, Dr. Ballou admitted that this book had been approved for reading assignment to pupils of that age, but said that the teacher did not recall assigning it in this instance, and added that all assignments are subject to approval by individual parents. In other words, according to Dr. Ballou, parents should not expect the public school to refrain from assigning such morally debasing literature to pupils, but parents must protect their children by directing noncompliance as to particular assignments. This book *Good Earth* was listed on page 9 of Washington School Document No. 5, 1933, entitled "*A Reading List in History for Senior High Schools*", and the continuing use of said list is specifically reendorsed by Dr. Ballou and the Board of Education on page 104 of Revised Course in History, and so forth, adopted June 5, 1935. Moreover, as recently as January 18, 1936, the aforementioned study magazine *Scholastic* reinvented the attention of high-school pupils to said book *Good Earth*, on page 14 of *Scholastic* issue of said date, under heading "*China as Viewed Through the Eyes of Pearl Buck*", saying:

"The author, in her novel, the *Good Earth*, writes of old China with its fetters of superstition and misunderstanding. She gives us a vivid description."

And so forth. It further appears that commencing on page 11 of *Scholastic* magazine of October 6, 1934, a chapter from the new book, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, by Thomas Minehan, was carried, with a commendatory introduction thereto as "both a vivid picture of nomad life and a challenge to a nation." During December 1935 and January 1936 my efforts to examine said book at the Library of Congress were fruitless, and I was finally told on January 16, 1936, by a special searcher in the reading room of said Library that the book was very popular with young persons and, on that account, he did not know how long it might be before I could examine it. I thereupon ordered a copy of the book from the publishers, and found it to be most debasing in every way. Not only does it refer slightly to patriotism, and laud communism, but it abounds in low and vile language and features promiscuous sensual relations and even stoops to blasphemous ditties.

Within the past month I have accidentally learned that in addition to his position of superintendent of schools, Dr. Ballou is on the board of trustees of the Public Library of the District of Columbia, which Public Library is declared by law to be "a supplement of the public educational system of said District" (sec. 1421, Rev. Ed. D. C. Code). I thereupon made a personal investigation to learn whether the aforesaid two objectionable books—*Good Earth* and *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*—had actually invaded said Public Library. I was amazed to find both of said books carried in said Public Library, and also in the 11 branches of said library scattered in various portions of this District. The main Public Library, located at Seventh and K Streets, is right now carrying and featuring said book, *Good Earth*, in a special display rack labeled "Books too good to miss." The branch libraries also carry said book, *Good Earth*, nine copies standing in a row on the shelves of the Mount Pleasant branch ready for instant reading. As to said other book, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, it has been car-

ried in the Public Library since as early as September 1934, four copies being now carried in said main Public Library, and each of the branch libraries also carry said book. The Mount Pleasant branch carries two copies of it. My efforts to see this last-named book, *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, at the Mount Pleasant branch have not been successful, the clerk there explaining to me that it is a right popular book, and the southeast branch advised me that the book is now in the bindery on account of its condition from use. Thus, the main department of our public educational system—the public school—is misused to induce or require pupils to read particular books of a morally debasing character, and another department—the Public Library—is cooperatively misused, and public funds wasted, in making such particular debasing books readily available to pupils intended to be thus victimized. Youth in the tenth grade and up are given adult cards in the Public Library. Surely, no time should be lost in fixing the exact and precise responsibility for such intolerable conditions, indicative of very serious malfeasance in office, and in dealing sternly and effectively with all persons found to be responsible. If the public educational system cannot be relied upon to safeguard morals and develop character, but may be used to destroy morals and character under the guise of liberality, academic freedom, or any other pretense, no decent self-respecting parent can be expected to subject his child to such jeopardy and danger.

PRESERVATION OF CONGRESSIONAL RIDER OF JUNE 14, 1935, AND ITS VIGOROUS ENFORCEMENT IMPERATIVE

What has thus been shown plainly demonstrates that the invasion of the public schools here by antipatriotic and other subversive matter has been upon a large scale and has been carefully planned, and, further, that these conditions have been going on for at least 3 years, and have, consequently, done inestimable harm and injury already to many thousands of our youth. These disclosures make it impossible for any informed, honest-minded person to doubt the wisdom of the original adoption of the congressional rider of June 14, 1935, or to question the necessity for its preservation and vigorous enforcement. Those who advocate its repeal are either ignorant of the undeniable conditions aforesaid or actually desirous of having such conditions continue. Those in the latter class should not stay in this country and enjoy the liberties which here prevail, but ought to go to Russia and accept there the yoke to which they would subject our children. Those in the former class have no possible excuse for remaining in a state of ignorance upon this important subject.

On December 18, 1935, the Board of Education approved the elimination of the aforementioned Achorn textbook, it being so moved by Dr. Ballou, who then stated he was advised it might be construed as "too favorable toward communism." This amounted to the suggestion that a textbook might properly be favorable toward communism, provided it was not considered as "too favorable." It is further significant that said Achorn book was originally adopted by the Board of Education in January 1935, in apparent disregard of admonitions then being given by this committee of the Congress. It is further significant that said Achorn book was continued in use in defiance of the congressional rider, and its discontinuance on December 18, 1935, occurred only when this federation was persistently demanding a special list which would reveal said book—

I want it noted, Mr. Speaker, that this Federation of Citizens Associations want the "red rider" kept intact and not repealed—

The Rugg textbook heretofore mentioned, in use in District of Columbia public schools for about 3 years, namely, since before January 1, 1933 (school document no. 2: 1933), was expressly declared by the Board of Education in said official school document to be for "slow-going pupils" in the junior and senior high schools. It is now claimed by said Board (through its approval of Maurer committee report of Dec. 18, 1935, p. 3) that the use of said Rugg textbook, which said Board concedes "might possibly be interpreted as favorable to communism" (p. 8 of Maurer report), was adopted "for experimental purposes only in the field of industrial history." Just why such a textbook embracing such subject matter should be used upon "slow-going pupils" at all, much less to experiment upon them, or why such an experiment should be carried on for about 3 years, is not explained. The Board of Education admits (p. 8 of Maurer report) that said Rugg textbook has been used since the schools reopened in September 1935, notwithstanding the congressional rider, but claims that the section on Russia was not taught in classrooms since such reopening, and that the presence of objectionable matter in a textbook is unobjectionable if it be not specifically dealt with in the classroom. The minutes of the Board of June 12, 1935, show that Dr. Ballou gave the Board advice at that time that, if the rider became law, such course could be followed, and textbooks containing objectionable matter need not be eliminated. The Board of Education has recently stated that the Rugg book is not to be further used, claiming that the school plans of June 1935 contemplated discontinuance of this book after the latter part of 1935 (p. 3 of Maurer report). In other words, it is suggested, after about 3 years of its use, that this particular book is not to be further used in such claimed experiment upon "slow-going pupils." This suggestion came for the first time nearly a month after the book had been protested, no such suggestion being made by the Board at the hearing when the protest was presented. The public is, moreover, entitled to know whether the purpose of such incom-

prehensible experiment upon "slow-going pupils" was to ascertain how many of them were converted to communism, or just what the purpose was.

The Board of Education refused to take action eliminating Scholastic as a study magazine, but approved instead its Maurer committee report styling this federation's unanswerable showing as "some strictures" and merely referred the matter to the superintendent of schools, who has continued said magazine in use among high-school pupils as a study magazine. Said Board has also failed to remedy any of the other intolerable conditions hereinbefore pointed out. Said Board has further refrained from conducting any thorough investigation of its own into textbooks generally to see that they do not violate the congressional rider. What has been presented by this federation embraces, of course, only such subject matter as has happened to come to the federation's attention. The federation lacks funds and facilities to fully investigate all textbooks, study magazines, etc., in use in the public schools.

It thus appears that the superintendent of schools and the Board of Education, the persons primarily responsible for the conditions in the public schools requiring correction, are evading prompt and full compliance with the congressional rider, and while so doing, are seeking to give the rider a ridiculous interpretation, namely, that textbooks containing communistic or other objectionable matter, may be retained in the public schools, provided such matter be not required to be studied by pupils. An admonition to pupils to skip such matter, thereby causing the pupils to take a special interest therein by reason of the air of mystery created, would, of course, be a necessary incident to such absurd proposition. This is a plain attempt by violators to utilize their own evasiveness to bring the law which they are violating into disrepute and thereby bring about its repeal. All textbooks, study magazines, etc., containing objectionable matter must be entirely eliminated unless absurdity and evasion be sanctioned as this federation clearly pointed out to the Board of Education on November 20, 1935. This composite condition of affairs, constituting a plain affront to Congress and to all practical fair-mindedness, caused this federation to adopt its resolution of January 4, 1936, declaring that—

"The recent action of the Board of Education makes it imperative that the Congress of the United States shall be appealed to without delay to provide an effectual remedy and one which will be so thorough that there can be no danger of a recurrence of existing conditions."

In conclusion, I should call the committee's attention to the fact that the American Historical Association, under whose auspices the afore-mentioned pernicious method book for teachers were prepared and published, was incorporated by act of Congress of January 4, 1889, and by such act was expressly limited to purposes "in the interest of American history and of history in America"; yet the said method books show that the association has been diverted from such authorized purposes to the radically contrary purpose of promoting the tenets or pretenses of Marxian communism, aided by a special aggregation of educators having such views, including some recently shown to be directly connected with communistic Moscow University, namely, George S. Counts and W. W. Charters. Moreover, Dr. Ballou's recommendations of textbooks and study magazines for history and social sciences in the District of Columbia public schools during the past 3 years are shown to have specially favored those connected with said American Historical Association, including Carl Becker (who was president of said association in 1931), Charles A. Beard, George S. Counts, Harold Rugg, and a number of others.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Sullivan, is your Federated Citizens Association, embracing some sixty-odd associations, in any way objecting to this rider that Congress passed last year?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Not at all. The federation strongly favors it, although there is a small minority element in the federation on that matter.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean, does your Federated Citizens Association oppose it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Absolutely not.

Mr. BLANTON. Have they taken any action against it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The attitude of the Federated Citizens Association is that that proposal ought to be strengthened.

Mr. BLANTON. They feel that, instead of repealing it, we ought to strengthen it?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir; it ought to be made even stronger than it is.

Mr. BLANTON. Your attitude is that we ought not to allow anything about communism to be taught in the schools?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It ought not to be taught in the public schools as a subject for social-science study. It should be explained as to its evil aims and consequences and denounced.

Mr. BLANTON. It should be denounced?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir. It should be expounded objectively as to its pernicious character and denounced.

Mr. BLANTON. This book *Conclusions and Recommendations* shows that Dr. Ballou was secretary of that commission for 5 years. Dr. Ballou admitted that the book was written by Counts and Beard; did you know that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I did not know that.

Mr. BLANTON. This book *Boy and Girl Tramps of America*, by Thomas Minnihan, is too vile to even quote from.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I quite agree. It is entirely.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you know that Dr. Ballou had admitted that it is one of the most vulgar, one of the vilest pieces of literature, that he had ever heard of being published?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I did not know that. I do not know why it is in the public-school libraries.

FROM TESTIMONY OF MAJ. GEN. AMOS A. FRIES

Tenth. Since the uninformed, the irresponsibles, the sympathetic pinks, and the reds are contending that there was no occasion for Congress passing the "red rider", I am going to take enough space in the Record to prove beyond doubt that Congress acted wisely and did so at the request of the substantial mothers and fathers of Washington when it passed the "red rider" to prevent communism from being indoctrinated in the schools. I quote the following from the testimony of Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries before our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. AMOS A. FRIES, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, PRESIDENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOL ASSOCIATION AND PAST DEPARTMENT COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. BLANTON. We have Gen. Amos A. Fries, who asks to be heard on the requested appropriation for character education and upon communism in the public schools. General Fries, you are a retired major general of the United States Army?

General FRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You have had how many years service in the United States Army, General?

General FRIES. I had more than 31 years commissioned service when I was retired.

Mr. BLANTON. Did you have service abroad?

General FRIES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. What service did you have during the war, General?

General FRIES. I was there throughout the World War, having sailed from New York on July 23, 1917, and returned December 18, 1918. I was Chief of what is now the Chemical Warfare Service throughout the war in France, having organized it and carried it through from start to finish.

Mr. BLANTON. How long have you lived in Washington?

General FRIES. I have lived in Washington since March 1, 1920, and I had been in Washington nearly 5 years before the war.

Mr. BLANTON. Is your permanent home now in Washington, General?

General FRIES. It is.

Mr. BLANTON. You have a home here?

General FRIES. I do.

Mr. BLANTON. You are what we call a resident of Washington?

General FRIES. I am.

Mr. BLANTON. And you are interested, as a citizen, in what goes on here?

General FRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. General Fries, you may proceed. If you care to make a statement about any matters, you may proceed, General. I know it interferes with your thought somewhat to be interrupted, and we won't interrupt you until you make your statement; but we do reserve the right to ask you questions when we see fit. Proceed in your own way, General, and later we will ask you questions.

General FRIES. I will say, first, that I have been interested in public schools all my life.

I graduated from high school and went to West Point, having taught fully 3 years in the public schools during the last couple of years I was in high school and for a year before I went to West Point. I make this statement to show that I have had considerable experience in teaching, having been for 3½ years an instructor and director in post-graduate military and civil engineering in the United States Engineering School.

We have had four children go through the public schools of the District of Columbia. For a period of 15 years we had from one to four children in those schools, and both Mrs. Fries and myself have taken an active interest in the schools. I have taken an interest with the American Legion and other patriotic organizations.

I began to see radicalism creeping into our schools, I thought, as early as 1922. I brought up, when I was department commander of the American Legion of the District of Columbia, in 1926, a matter that was referred to me by a citizen of the District and a patron, complaining of a certain teacher in one of the high schools.

A year ago I was appointed chairman of a committee by the American Legion to investigate and report on the character education program. We opposed that appropriation then, and while the Legion has taken no very recent action, I am sure its position still stands. I want to submit later our final report of two pages. I am not going to read all of it at this time. However, I do want to read two short paragraphs because I think they sum up, in many ways, my attitude on this question, with particular reference to Dr. Charters [reading]:

"When challenged, Dr. Charters protests his enthusiasm for American forms and doctrines. However, he admits his membership on the advisory council of the Soviet's Moscow University, an appointment accepted at the suggestion of Stephen Duggan, who, in his turn, admits that the advisory council, in cooperation with the Soviet educational authorities, initiated the requirement that Americans and others attending the university take a fundamental course in the principles of the collective society. In our opinion,

Dr. Charters' connection with the Soviet educational system, however remote it may be, unfits him for any connection with the public schools of Washington.

"It is not sufficient that those in charge of the education of our children refrain from indoctrinating them with communism. Our school authorities and teachers should and must be persons thoroughly imbued with an understanding of, and enthusiasm for American ideals and methods. Anything short of that wholly unfits them for the task of teaching children of graded-school and high-school age."

I would say, further, I am here as president of the District of Columbia Public School Association. Last October when it was made known that communism would be taught in the schools, regardless of the rider, the public school association held a protest meeting and vigorously protested that they were against any weakening of that rider. We made it very clear in presenting the case at that time to the Board of Education that the statements that are frequently made to the effect that we are trying to stifle information are absolutely absurd and incorrect, and we insisted that the truth of communism was not made known whatever to our children; that what was covered in the school textbooks and in the papers circulated were sugar-coated platitudes, which could only deceive the children into thinking that communism as it exists in Russia is a fine thing.

Within a few days after the public school association held a protest meeting, October 28, 1935, against the teaching of communism in the District of Columbia schools, in spite of the law forbidding such teaching, the American Civil Liberties Union announced (according to an article in the Washington Daily News) that they had a committee working up a program to support Dr. Frank W. Ballou and the local school board. At least two lawyers who do work for the A. C. L. U. appeared at the school board meeting, November 6, 1935, when protests were made against teaching communism in the schools by many civic associations besides the public school association.

Since several college professors, besides John Dewey, are on the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union, I desire to submit the following extract from page 56 of House Report 2290, Seventy-first Congress, third session, where Roger Baldwin, a "director" and spokesman for the American Civil Liberties Union, told what his organization stands for—

I want my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to note carefully what Roger Baldwin stands for—

"The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of a citizen or alien—it does not make any difference which—to advocate murder?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Or assassination?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does your organization uphold the right of an American citizen to advocate force and violence for the overthrow of the Government?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Certainly; insofar as as mere advocacy is concerned.

"The CHAIRMAN. Does it uphold the right of an alien in this country to urge the overthrow and advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Precisely on the same basis as any citizen.

"The CHAIRMAN. You do uphold the right of an alien to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence?"

"Mr. BALDWIN. Sure; certainly. It is the healthiest kind of a thing for a country, of course, to have free speech, unlimited."

Now, the congressional committee's definition of communism is this:

"The following is a definition of communism, a world-wide political organization advocating:

"1. Hatred of God and all forms of religion.

"2. Destruction of private property, and inheritance.

"3. Absolute social and racial equality; promotion of class hatred.

"4. Revolutionary propaganda through the Communist International, stirring up Communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed, and civil war.

"5. Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties, such as freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and trial by jury.

"6. The ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of soviet socialist republics with the capital at Moscow."

In my opinion, that is an absolutely fair and accurate definition.

Mr. BLANTON. Of communism?

General FRIES. Yes, sir.

NUMBER KILLED OR EXECUTED IN RUSSIA

"Henri Bero, a French Socialist, has gathered figures showing that the number of people who have been killed or executed since the Soviet regime came into power in Russia is almost unbelievable. His figures of the known dead are as follows:

"Twenty-eight bishops and higher clergy, 6,778 priests, 6,585 school teachers, 8,000 doctors, 51,850 army officers, 200,850 policemen and other officials, and 11,488,520 peasants and artisans. These make the staggering total of 11,726,746. Nearly 2,000,000 more dead than the total killed in the World War."

Mr. BLANTON. You mean 2,000,000 more were executed in Russia than were killed in the World War?

General FRIES. That has nothing to do with the 20,000,000 that died of starvation.

PROTEST OF AMERICAN LEGION AGAINST APPROPRIATIONS FOR CHARACTER EDUCATION

Now, I want to take up the so-called character education in the District of Columbia schools. As I stated, the American Legion, a year ago, protested against any appropriations for that on the grounds that it was not teaching character.

Mr. BLANTON. Do you have a copy of that protest?

General FRIES. Yes, sir; I read a quotation from that previously. I am going to put that report in the record.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish you would.

General FRIES. Yes. The report is as follows:

"Report to the executive committee, Department of the District of Columbia, American Legion, of special committee to investigate 'character' education in the Washington public schools

"Your special committee appointed to investigate the scheme of 'character' education in the Washington public schools, having investigated the subject, reports back the following findings and conclusions, with a recommendation:

"The 'character' education experiment was introduced in the local public schools in September 1934. Little is known about the details of the system except that its proponents hold out the idea that it is intended to 'develop fine characters in boys and girls of Washington.' Similar claims are made for most of the facts that are sought to be introduced at the expense of taxpayers.

"The very suggestion of the establishment of a special system or course of 'character' education in the public schools carries with it an implication that the public-school system is a failure. Character is something which is developed within one's self. It is not supplied from the outside. True, the development of character is affected by education, but only to the extent that cultural advancement through general education tends to enhance intelligence and enable one to understand and endeavor to eliminate in one's self faults that detract from character. The province of the schools in this respect is, through the teaching of sound curricula, to advance the intelligence of our children, and, further, the maintenance of a high standard of character among the teaching personnel whose precept and example have much to do with the development of the characters of the pupils under their direction. When public-school authorities suggest establishment of a special and distinct course or system of 'character education', it is obvious that they have lost sight of the proper function of the schools, or have failed to set up adequate curricula, or to maintain a high ethical standard for the teaching personnel. The cure will be found in a correction of these defects and not in the establishment of any new system, misnamed 'character education'.

"The expense of the course, estimated at about \$87,000 annually, would constitute an unjust and unnecessary burden on the taxpayers, wholly out of proportion to any beneficial results that might be expected.

"Home environment and family influences, as well as religious training, are the chief and most important elements in the development of character. Parents have a tremendous and appropriate responsibility in this regard. One of the worst effects of the establishment of a so-called 'character education' system in the public schools would be its tendency to undermine the parents' sense of responsibility. The scheme is another move toward the undermining of the integrity of the American family—another step toward encouraging parents to foist their responsibilities onto public agencies—another advance in the direction of substituting governmental agencies in the execution of proper family functions; it smacks of the communistic doctrine that families are nonexistent, religion is passé, and children are the chattels of the State. Is it any wonder, then, that we find that the person selected to direct such activities in the Washington public schools has been touched by the influence of Moscow? Why, in establishing the 'character education' system, did our school authorities have to search so far beyond our borders to find a competent advisor and finally pick up in Ohio Dr. W. W. Charters, a member of the advisory committee of Moscow University?

"It is not sufficient that those in charge of the education of our children refrain from indoctrinating them with communism. Our school authorities and teachers should and must be persons thoroughly imbued with an understanding of, and enthusiasm for, American ideals and methods. Anything short of that wholly unfit them for the task of teaching children of graded-school and high-school age.

"Those under whose care our children are placed for educational purposes should have no connection, remote or otherwise, with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. After all, this is America, and we want our children raised and educated as Americans. They can derive nothing of benefit to themselves or their country from teachings tainted by any of the doctrines evolved by a benighted nation whose people of the present generation are just beginning to emerge from the Stygian darkness of serfdom, whose people have never yet known the blessings of liberty. When the Russian people have passed through their present ordeal of communism and hate-bred enmity of others, when they have had time to become educated and to appraise and correct their present

political and economic schemes born of ignorance, when they have groped their way to the status of an enlightened nation, when, in short, the Russian people have grown to adult status intellectually, then perhaps they may contribute something worthwhile to the culture and advancement of the world. In the meantime, we do not want any part of their methods introduced here or any of their influences present in the education of our children.

"We recommend that the Department of the District of Columbia, the American Legion, register its opposition to any continuation of the so-called character-education system in the public schools of Washington.

"AMOS A. FRIES, Chairman.

"HOWARD E. SNYDER.

"H. W. LINEBURG.

"RAYMOND J. QUEENIN.

"FRANK L. PECKHAM."

I have here an address by Dr. Ballou, delivered in New York City, November 1, 1934. Dr. Ballou sent me this under date of January 30, 1935, knowing that myself and the others in the Legion, as well as other organizations, were opposed to the so-called character education.

Mr. BLANTON. Have you ever been an officer in the Legion?

General FRIES. I am a past department commander of the American Legion, District of Columbia. On page 2 this statement is made by Dr. Ballou:

"The character-education experiment, which was systematically inaugurated in the public schools of Washington in September 1934, grew out of the investigation of crime and racketeering conducted by a committee of the United States Senate of which Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, of New York, is chairman."

On page 4 he stated:

"In preparation for the beginning of the experiment an institute or conference was held for a period of 3 weeks, beginning June 25."

I want to say right here that I called up Mr. COPELAND's secretary and verified the fact that the first hearings were held August 14, 1933, and the last hearings were held on January 31, 1934. In an article entitled "The Copeland Experiment in the District of Columbia", by Dr. Charters—

Mr. BLANTON. Do you mean Dr. W. W. Charters?

General FRIES. Yes, sir; Dr. W. W. Charters. He says: "Washington was selected for this study", which means this character-education experiment, "partly because it was a convenient location, partly because Superintendent Ballou and the Board of Education are enthusiastic about the project, and partly because the teaching corps of the city has been working upon the problem for the last 5 years."

Mr. BLANTON. What is the date of that speech he made?

General FRIES. This was published in October 1934.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it would mean that before October 1934 Dr. Ballou and the teaching corps had been working on that 5 years.

General FRIES. Yes; and yet Dr. Ballou and Charters both say it was based on the crime investigations which did not start until the middle of August 1933 and did not end until January 31, 1934.

Now, to show that Charters did not make an error, we find this statement of his on page 12:

"Our program has through the years increased this range, as indicated in our School Document No. 9, 1931" (Preliminary Report on Character Education in the District of Columbia).

In other words, in 1931 a preliminary report on character education in the District of Columbia was submitted, about 3 years before Dr. Charters made his speech and 2 years before he says character education was introduced in the schools of the District because of the crime investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. And 2 years before the Senate crime investigation?

General FRIES. Yes, sir.

Now, Dr. Charters, as shown on page 15 of this report of the Commission on the Social Studies, was one of those working with that committee of 17 originally, of which Dr. Ballou was secretary throughout 5 years, January 1, 1929, to January 1, 1934, and chairman of at least one subcommittee, and a member of two other subcommittees, there being five subcommittees. Dr. Charters was one of those working on problems.

Mr. BLANTON. Dr. Ballou admitted that that book was written by George S. Counts and Dr. Charles A. Beard. You knew that, didn't you?

General FRIES. I have heard that statement made. In other words, as we have shown here, Mr. Chairman, from the statements of Dr. Charters, there was a group in the District of Columbia schools working on this character education approximately the same 5 years that Dr. Ballou was working with this commission, of which he was secretary throughout 5 years, and in which he was chairman of one subcommittee and a member of two others.

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection, General, does that coincide in time with the 5-year program of Soviet Russia?

General FRIES. Well, Russia is the one who has popularized 5-year programs.

Mr. JOHNSON. Do you know who those teachers were here working in connection with it?

General FRIES. One of them was Mr. Jones, because he is mentioned as one working with them, and also Paul Lutz, of Teachers College.

An 11-page mimeograph marked in the lower left-hand corner of the last page, "LF 1/12/31", and distributed to certain teachers,

has the title "Character Education in History." (Statement prepared by Mr. Jones in 1929.)

The above dates correspond with the date (Jan. 1, 1929) when the committee on the social sciences with Dr. Ballou as secretary began its work, and the date, January 12, 1931, agrees with the date Dr. Charters mentions as the date of Preliminary Report on Character Education in the District of Columbia, quoted earlier.

The Mr. Jones referred to is Prof. George J. Jones, head of the history department in Dr. Ballou's Washington schools. I quote further:

Mr. BLANTON. General, it may be interesting to you to know that, as shown by our printed hearings a year ago, Dr. Ballou testified that he had selected Dr. W. W. Charters to guide this character education in the District of Columbia and was paying him \$50 a lecture for coming here regularly to deliver lectures to guide it here in the District of Columbia.

General FRIES. I want to go back for just one moment to Dr. Ballou's address, in which the says, "In these daily conferences", quoting, "the program for inaugurating the experiment was developed."

Mr. JOHNSON. These daily conferences for what?

General FRIES. Character education.

Mr. JOHNSON. When?

General FRIES. They started June 25, 1934. [Reading]:

"In these daily conferences the program for inaugurating the experiment was developed. The conferences were presided over by Dr. W. W. Charters, of Ohio State University, who was assisted by Dr. Ben D. Wood, of Columbia University; Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, of Ohio State University; and Dr. Charles R. Mann, director emeritus of the American Council on Education."

I just want to call your attention to this—that Dr. Charters and Dr. Ben Wood both are mentioned in this book, Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, and both took part in them. Dr. Charters and Dr. Mann were both members of the Moscow Advisory Council.

FROM DR. BALLOU'S ADDRESS, ATLANTIC CITY, FEBRUARY 26, 1935

"As a superintendent of schools I am heartily in accord with the general idea that schools must play an important part in social change. When the consensus of the American people shall have decided the kind of a social order they want I think the schools are prepared to give instruction in that social order."

Mr. JOHNSON. In other words, prepare them in advance?

General FRIES. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. For a change in our system.

General FRIES. Yes, our civilization.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is what he means.

General FRIES. Dr. Ballou said in a newspaper statement quoted earlier "Don't try to tell our children what they should do or what kind of a philosophy they should have, in the future" and here he is saying practically the same thing.

Mr. BLANTON. Right there, turning to page 477 of the previous hearings, Dr. Ballou said:

"What we are trying to do is set up a new philosophy of education—"

Mr. Clerk, read what Dr. Ballou then said he had to do about the teachers.

The CLERK (reading):

"whose philosophy has got to be changed fundamentally."

Mr. JOHNSON. That is on page 477?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. What hearing?

Mr. BLANTON. For the fiscal year 1936. Then, read the statement appearing on page 482 of the 1936 hearings.

The CLERK (reading):

"Mr. CANNON. It seems to me rather a startling statement that the philosophy of all teachers engaged must be changed in order to introduce correct training in the schools. I had supposed that the philosophy of every good teacher includes correct training."

On page 106 it states:

"But the State can be expected to move in this direction only in response to pressure arising from some group or groups of citizens."

That is practically what Dr. Counts has said in his book, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* In other words, the teachers should seize power, and, therefore, it is stated above that "the State can only be expected to move" by pressure, from some group or groups of citizens.

I consider this one of the most vicious things I have ever read.

On page 119 it states:

"The program for the teaching of the social sciences which the commission has outlined in its report is designed for a system of public schools functioning in and serving immediately American society."

In other words, this is for the public schools, not for any college.

On page 133, paragraph 12, it states:

"In order that the individual teacher, out of loyalty to this supreme ideal of social-science instruction, may be protected against the assaults of ignorant majorities, heresy-hunting minorities, and all self-constituted guardians of public morals and thought, the profession as a whole must make provision for the review of controversies, thus arising, by trained specialists, competent to pass judgment upon the scholarship, subject matter, and manner of presentation in question."

Then, paragraph 13, following:

"In the case of unfair or unwise dismissal the profession must be prepared to conduct energetic and appropriate inquiries and, by resort to the courts if necessary, see that justice is done, damages asked, and reinstatement achieved."

That is just practically an open statement that they propose to bludgeon the people into taking the school system as well as the teachers they approve of.

Among those most active on the Commission on the Social Studies, which has been quoted from at length, we find the names of Prof. George S. Counts, of Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, and Dr. Charles A. Beard, historian and formerly of Columbia University.

OLD DOG TRAY IN BAD COMPANY

I will now quote from Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling's *The Red Network, a Who's Who in Radicalism*, giving the close associates of Dr. Ballou, for whom he served as their secretary during the 5 years they were planning their book, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, which Dr. Ballou now admits was so very radical that he refused to sign it—to wit:

DR. CHARLES A. BEARD, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its *Who's Who in Radicalism*, embraces Dr. Charles A. Beard, "a college professor", and states that—

He is a supporter of the radical Rand School.

DR. CHARLES S. COUNTS, "RADICAL"

The Red Network, in its *Who's Who in Radicalism*, embraces Dr. George S. Counts, described as—

Professor, Teachers' College, Columbia University, showing membership in, and relationship to, and author of, various communistic organizations and communistic books.

DR. BALLOU ADMITS THAT BEARD AND COUNTS ARE "RADICALS"

After serving with them for 5 years on a commission, he being its secretary, Dr. Frank W. Ballou says that both Dr. Charles A. Beard and Dr. George S. Counts are "radicals", and they are the ones whom Dr. Ballou says wrote *Conclusions and Recommendations*, which was the main product of the 5 years' work of his Commission on the Social Studies:

Mr. DITTER. You understand what I mean by the term "radical"?
Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Interpreting my use of the term, would you say, sir, that there were any in this group who would fall into that category, such as I have described by the term "radical"?

Dr. BALLOU. I am clearly of the opinion that the discussion shows that is so.

Mr. DITTER. Would you care to give us your opinion as to where one Charles A. Beard would fall in such a classification?

Dr. BALLOU. I think he is an extreme left-end man.

Mr. DITTER. By left-end man, do you mean by that "radical"?

Dr. BALLOU. A liberal or radical.

Mr. DITTER. Very liberal or radical?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. DITTER. Would you say that George S. Counts would fall in that same category?

Dr. BALLOU. I think he stands very close to Mr. Beard.

Yet Dr. Ballou acted as the secretary for Dr. Beard and Dr. Counts for 5 years in getting up said communistic book, *Conclusions and Recommendations*.

DR. BALLOU PREFERRED NOT TO DISSENT

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., February 15, 1936.

MR. WILLIAM A. DUVALL,

Clerk, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the
District of Columbia, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I refer to your letter of February 13 about the volume, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, which forms a part of the report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association. You ask me to furnish you with any communication which Dr. Frank Ballou may have sent indicating his reasons for refusing to sign these conclusions and recommendations of the commission. Dr. Ballou was invited to state his reasons for dissent, and facilities were offered to him for printing his dissenting opinion as an appendix to the book in question. He preferred not to do so.

Yours very truly,

CONTERS READ, Secretary.

Mr. BLANTON: You are acquainted, are you not, with the assertion on page 133 of said book, *Conclusions and Recommendations*, published by your commission, that the individual teacher of social science instruction should be protected against the assaults of "ignorant majorities"?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I think they should be protected against the assault of anybody. I do not know what that statement means.

Mr. BLANTON. Does it mean that if the majority of the people of Washington wanted their children to be safe from communism here in the Washington schools that you ought to have protection from them?

Dr. BALLOU. Not at all.

Mr. BLANTON. What is meant by "the assault of ignorant majorities"?

Dr. BALLOU. I do not know. You will have to ask the writer.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you are acquainted, are you not, with the following statement on page 142 of said book of your commission, Conclusions and Recommendations [reading]:

"In the steadily integrating social order of the present and future, if education is to be given competent and relevant direction, the emphasis in the professional education of the administrator must be laid again on social science, social philosophy, and statecraft."

Dr. BALLOU. Who is the author of that statement?

Mr. BLANTON. That appears in Conclusions and Recommendations, at page 142.

Dr. BALLOU. Of course, I will admit I am familiar with every paragraph in the book. I have read it many times.

Mr. BLANTON. But that is a statement that you do not agree with? You can read it over. There is the paragraph.

Dr. BALLOU. No; I could not accept that.

Mr. BLANTON. You do not accept that, do you?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not also true, Doctor, that on June 5, 1935, on the recommendation of yourself, the Board of Education approved a revised course in history and other social studies, and that on the last page of such approved document, School Document No. 1, 1936, the following appears as one of the approved reading courses under heading [reading]:

"General Reference Readings on Methods for Teachers; Report of the Commission on the Social Studies; American Historical Association."

Dr. BALLOU. Yes, sir; I expect it is there.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then you did put this in as one of your approved books?

Dr. BALLOU. We put that in the list of books that would be of benefit to the teachers.

Mr. DITTER. Is it still there?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes; I expect it is still there.

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, you recall, do you not, writing Mrs. E. N. Dingley on February 11, 1935, that [reading]:

"The commission on the social studies of the American Historical Association, of which I was a member and which devoted 5 years to the study of this subject, was unanimously of the opinion that our study of history should increasingly have to do with the history of modern times as compared with the former emphasis on history of ancient times and should deal impartially and dispassionately with some of the current problems of economics and sociology. The commission recognized that in undertaking to do this it might be criticized for the way in which it dealt with the problems of capitalism, labor, and many patriotic subjects."

Dr. BALLOU. I recognize that.

Mr. BLANTON. You did write that?

Dr. BALLOU. Yes.

12. STATEMENT OF HARRY N. STULL, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. STULL. I represent the Federation of Citizens' Associations, chairman of the committee on education.

Mr. BLANTON. Chairman of the committee on education for the Federation of Citizens' Associations?

Mr. STULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. You are the duly authorized spokesman for the committee on education of the Federation of Citizens' Associations?

Mr. STULL. That is correct; yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. There are some sixty-odd associations in your federation?

Mr. STULL. Sixty-three; that is right.

Mr. BLANTON. There is a rider on last year's appropriation bill, to eliminate communism from our public schools. Are you for or against that rider? Are you with us in our attempt to stop communism?

Mr. STULL. Yes; I am in favor of that rider.

Mr. BLANTON. You want us to stop communism in the schools?

Mr. STULL. Yes, sir; I do; and my idea about that is that the ruling of the Corporation Counsel, Mr. Prettyman, was a proper one.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have quoted enough excerpts from the voluminous mass of evidence before our subcommittee to show that the contention that there was no reason for passing the "red rider" is not true, but false.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 5

That the "red rider" prevents factual instruction.

From Corporation Counsel Prettyman's opinion, I quote the following:

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL,
September 5, 1935.

To the Commissioners:

We think that the word "communism" refers to the governmental forms and theories of the present-day Communist parties

composing the Internationale. Chief among their economic and political tenets are (1) the abolition of private ownership of property and the substitution thereof of a system of common ownership, (2) control of the government by the proletariat (wage earners without property), that is, a dictatorship by the proletariat, (3) the destruction of present systems of government and the substitution thereof of other systems adapted to the theory of proletarian dictatorship. These tenets are, of course, directly opposed to the established American system, which includes among its principal bases private ownership of property, governmental control by a majority of all classes, periodically expressed, and a governmental system, legislative, executive, and judicial, designed to function in accordance with these concepts. The congressional intent in the present statute was obviously directed to the protection of this system against internal attack.

The word "advocate" is easy of definition in this context. It means to plead for or to urge the adoption of.

Much more difficult is the exact definition of the limits of the word "teach" as it appears here. In ordinary parlance it may mean to enlighten, or to indoctrinate, or to nurture, or to train. Clearly, any teaching of communism which has for its purpose or its intended effect the nurture, the training, or the indoctrination of the pupils in communistic thought is forbidden by this statute.

But I am of opinion that the mere informing of pupils concerning the history, existence, or theories of the communistic governments or parties is not prohibited. Obviously Congress did not mean to prohibit comment or instruction which is adverse to communism, that is, teaching against it. Neither does it seem to me that the congressional intent reaches to the recital, without any shadow of favor or support, of factual data, whether historical, economic, or political. There is a vital difference here between teaching and teaching about. To state that communism exists is not to teach it. To state what Communists believe is not to teach communism within the meaning of this statute, provided that the method or manner of statement does not imply approval.

Thus I am of opinion that the mere recitation or study of factual data is not the teaching prohibited by this statute. But I am also of the view that any shadow of favor or support of communism shown by or reasonably to be drawn from such recitation or study is prohibited.

E. BARRETT PRETTYMAN,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

The corporation counsel is the legal authority for the District. He holds that the "red rider" does not prevent proper factual instruction. He says that all it does is to prevent indoctrination.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 6

That Comptroller General McCarl has interfered with the academic freedom of teachers.

No person can show one line from McCarl interfering with academic freedom. When Dr. Ballou refused to instruct his teachers to obey the law as construed by Prettyman, and contended that Congress had no right to restrict his teachers as to what they shall not teach, McCarl required them to make an affidavit that they had not violated the law.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 7

That teachers are insulted by having to make affidavits.

Why are teachers insulted? The President makes an affidavit. Cabinet officers make affidavits. Generals and admirals make affidavits. Senators and Congressmen make affidavits. Teachers can blame no one but Superintendent Ballou. He could easily eliminate affidavits.

"DID NOT SEE FIT TO DO IT"

To show that by instructing his teachers that they must obey the law passed by Congress as construed by the corporation counsel, Dr. Ballou could have stopped all affidavits, I quote the following from our printed hearings:

Mr. BLANTON. Doctor, is it not a fact that I proposed to you that if you would advise the teachers of Washington that Congress had passed a law that they should neither teach nor advocate communism, that the Comptroller General would withdraw that requirement, and that the teachers would not be required to make any further affidavits? Didn't I propose that to you?

Dr. BALLOU. You proposed that to me.

Mr. BLANTON. You could have submitted that suggestion to the Board of Education yourself, could you not?

Dr. BALLOU. Well, I have not.

Mr. BLANTON. You could have done it, couldn't you, Doctor?

Dr. BALLOU. I could have done anything, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. You did not see fit to do it, Doctor?

Mr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that you replied to me that you would never agree that the right of the teachers to teach according to their method of teaching should be taken away from them?

Dr. BALLOU. No, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. I will say this to you now, Doctor, that if you will instruct your teachers tomorrow that Congress has passed a law that prevents them from teaching or advocating communism in the public schools, and this law must be obeyed, I know that this committee can have Comptroller General McCarl withdraw the requirement of those affidavits immediately. Now, if the affidavits are inconvenient, aren't you willing to issue that instruction to them?

Dr. BALLOU. I am not authorized to issue that instruction until the Board takes action.

Mr. BLANTON. You were not sufficiently interested in the matter to have proposed it to the Board of Education.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 8

That there was no authority to allow witnesses to testify about communism.

Our subcommittee was holding hearings on requests for appropriations. We had to decide whether we would allow or disallow them. Dr. Ballou requested \$78,660 for his so-called character education. As testified by Judge Sullivan, Major General Fries, and many other witnesses, said character education was just a smoke screen for indoctrinating communism, and was inseparably connected with communism. Our subcommittee, after hearing all witnesses, voted unanimously not to allow the \$78,660, and the full Committee on Appropriations, consisting of 39 members, approved our action, and the House of Representatives passed our 83-page bill without amendment, with only 26 Members voting against it on roll call.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 9

That our subcommittee abused witnesses, did not give them time needed, and conducted star-chamber proceedings.

The above is false in its entirety. The following is what the members of our subcommittee say about it:

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

As members of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the District of Columbia, we certify that our hearings presided over by our chairman, Mr. BLANTON, on the \$78,660 appropriation requested for so-called character education, which incidentally involved the question of indoctrinating communism in our schools, were conducted in a way that was fair and just to everyone. We heard at length Superintendent Frank W. Ballou, Prof. George J. Jones, head of the history and social studies department, and members of the Board of Education they brought with them. Chairman BLANTON was courteous to everyone and patiently heard every witness they wanted heard, and we devoted 4 hours continuous hearing to Editor Robinson, of Scholastic, and we allowed Congressman ELLENBOGEN to accompany Robinson and remain throughout his entire testimony. We heard every witness who wanted to be heard and gave them such time as they requested. After concluding the hearings, our subcommittee voted unanimously not to allow the \$78,600, as we believed it was being wasted and used for subversive purposes, and we refused to put this \$78,600 in the appropriation bill.

CLARENCE CANNON,
B. M. JACOBSEN,
GEORGE W. JOHNSON,
J. W. DITTER,
*Members of Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations.*

Attest:

As clerk, I was present during entire hearings and know above is correct.

WILLIAM A. DUVALL, Clerk.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 10

That Washington people want the "sissy bill" enacted and the "red rider" repealed.

That contention is absurd. Without a referendum, the only way to get the sentiment of the Washington people is through their organizations. The Federation of Citizens' Associations, embracing 63 different organizations of citizens, through their chosen committee, George E. Sullivan, Harry N. Stull, Mrs. George Corbin, and Mrs. Horace Phelps, say that Washington people want the "red rider", and do not want the "sissy bill" that would repeal it. The American Legion, through its representatives, says it wants the "red rider" and does not want the "sissy bill." The ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic say they want the "red rider" and do not want the "sissy bill." The District of Columbia Public School Association, embracing over 90 different organizations of citizens, says that it wants the "red rider" and does not want the "sissy bill."

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 11

That the House of Representatives is practically unanimous against the "red rider."

How does anyone know that? Such assertion is foolish. That will be decided by a vote. I offered to join the proponent of the "sissy bill" to ask the Speaker to allow him to call it up under suspension of rules that day, but he would not risk it. It is my firm belief that by an overwhelming vote the House will refuse to repeal the "red rider" and kill the "sissy bill"; but, until we vote, no one can speak with authority.

MALICIOUS FALSEHOOD NO. 12

That the District subcommittee hearings accorded all witnesses fair treatment and warranted the passage of the "sissy bill" and repeal of the "red rider."

The hearings show this subcommittee met on February 25, at 10:30 a. m., and adjourned at noon; that it next met on March 2, at 10:30 a. m., recessed at 12:30 to 2, and adjourned at 5:06; next met on March 9, at 10:30, recessed at 12:30 to 2:30, and adjourned at 4:45, hence altogether it devoted only 10 hours and 21 minutes to its entire hearings, while our Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations devoted 4 full hours to hearing Editor Robinson of the Scholastic, alone.

Chairman KENNEDY prefaced the hearings by saying:

Unless there is objection on the part of the subcommittee, we will hear from the proponents of the bill, but not from the opponents (p. 2).

Page 1 notes the presence of Congressmen KENNEDY, SCHULTE, and BREWSTER, members; and Mrs. CAROLINE O'DAY, and Messrs. SISSON and MAVERICK. The proponent stated he preferred not to make any statement at that time, though he (not on committee) was allowed to interrogate witnesses.

On the second day, besides committeemen, there was noted the presence of Congressmen SISSON, ELLENBOGEN, SCOTT, and MAVERICK. Both Mr. SISSON and Mr. ELLENBOGEN, not committeemen, were allowed to interrogate witnesses. Thus 58 printed pages were consumed in hearings before any opponent was heard, and I quote the following from the statement of Mrs. JENCKES, a Representative in Congress from Indiana:

Mrs. JENCKES of Indiana. * * * I charge as a Member of Congress that the Board of Education in the District of Columbia is unfit to administer the great responsibility of public trust which rests upon them.

I charge the Board of Education with deliberate neglect and inefficiency.

I charge the Board of Education of the District of Columbia with assuming a responsibility the parents of children attending the District's schools never intended them to assume nor will permit them to assume.

I charge the Board of Education with neglect in line of duty.

I charge the Board of Education with inefficiency in the administration of the finances of the school system in our Nation's Capital.

I make these charges as a Member of Congress and as a member of the Subcommittee on Education in the District of Columbia Committee of the House of Representatives.

I ask my colleagues on this Subcommittee on Education not to be rushed or stampeded by the Board of Education into reporting this bill out of committee until I can place before you an official brief over my signature as a Member of Congress and as a member of this committee which will give you in detail specific references and proofs of the charges I make. There is no need for the "rail-roading" of this legislation.

Now, I desire to make a charge against the Board of Education of the District of Columbia as an American mother. I appeal to every mother in the District of Columbia and throughout the Nation to open your eyes, become informed concerning the indoctrination of communism in the public schools of our Nation's Capital as well as the schools throughout America.

As an American mother, I charge the Board of Education with deliberately betraying a public trust. I ask mothers to resent this with all the fury at their command. I ask mothers to investigate this horrible thing which the Board of Education has knowingly permitted to touch children in the schools in our Nation's Capital. I warn you, your children are in danger. I appeal to you mothers to arouse yourselves. The unpatriotic agencies who would make America a godless nation, the insidious agencies who would break down our American form of Government, who would nationalize women and children, who would tear down our churches and our cherished American institutions, are asking the Congress to make it easy to place in the hands of children of immature

judgment information about communism. There is no need for this. Children of immature years are not capable of rejecting the vile philosophies of communism. In Washington, almost at the very doors of the Board of Education Building, exists a school, operated and maintained by the Communist Party, which takes up the instruction of communism where the Board of Education of the District of Columbia leaves off. This is a part of a Nation-wide movement to plant schools of communism operated by the Communists in close proximity to public schools. The existence of the School for Communism operated by the Communists is known to the Crime Prevention Bureau of the Washington Metropolitan Police Department.

The instruction course on communism which the Board of Education of the District of Columbia authorized as a preparatory course for the instruction course on communism given by the School of Communism operated by the Communists.

Although they were not members of the subcommittee, and Mrs. JENCKES was a member, both Mr. Sisson and Mr. ELLENBOGEN insisted on cross-examining the lady from Indiana, and I quote from page 61:

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. If the lady will permit me for a moment, the lady does not propose to file a brief and conclude the hearing with the filing of that brief because if the lady is given that privilege that surely would be a most unfair thing.

Mrs. JENCKES. They shall have every opportunity to answer that.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. When will you have that?

Mrs. JENCKES. I will have it by Wednesday. I would have had it with me if I had not been in bed all last week, and I was not prepared to come here this morning.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I would like to say to the lady that I for one shall object to any extension of remarks in this hearing because the members of the subcommittee should have an opportunity to interrogate the lady on the subject. I would like to ask the lady a few questions.

Mrs. JENCKES. Please refrain until you have had my statement.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. In regard to this statement, does the lady object to the members of the school board being appointed by the judiciary; why doesn't the lady charge the judiciary—

Mrs. JENCKES. The judiciary appointed the school board.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Does the lady intend to charge that the judges in the District of Columbia are secretly fostering communism?

Mrs. JENCKES. I am not making any charges in regard to the judges whatever.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I want to say to the lady that in my district in the State of Pennsylvania the members of the school board are appointed by the judges and the judges are elected by the people, whereas in the District of Columbia the judges are appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, which is elected by the people. The method of the election of the school board by the judges was resorted to because it was thought that was the best method to keep politics out of our Board of Education, and if the lady desires to propose a different system in the District of Columbia, of course, that could be considered, but that is an indirect charge against the judges of the District of Columbia, and I think in her brief the lady should cover that question.

Now, I would like to ask the lady if she knows that that school of communism is attended by children or adults in the District of Columbia. Who is attending it?

Mrs. JENCKES. I do not know, Mr. ELLENBOGEN. This morning I am not strong enough to answer your question. I will have all that information in the brief, and I shall send you a copy at the same time I send it to the committee.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, before the lady leaves—

Mr. KENNEDY. I think she is not disposed to answer the question.

Mr. Sisson. I do not know whether I have any standing in this matter, but I will inquire of the chairman and will accept the ruling of the committee if I do have any right to ask the lady from Indiana any questions in regard to the wholesale charges she has just made here.

Then there was not another opponent heard until you get to page 104 of the printed hearings, when George E. Sullivan appeared for the Federation of Citizens' Associations. At the outstart here is the way he was circumscribed:

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Sullivan. How long will it take you to conclude your statement?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I think it will take somewhere between 1 hour and 1 hour and a half. I will make it as concise as possible.

Mr. KENNEDY. We do not have that much time.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I am merely giving what is essential.

Mr. KENNEDY. I suggest that you make a briefer statement and file any statement which will take that amount of time in writing.

Mr. SHORT. We have very important matters to consider in the House. One matter is the impeachment of a United States Federal judge, and we will have to vote on that.

Mr. KENNEDY. See if you cannot conclude in 15 minutes.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I cannot possibly do so in 15 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Go ahead and get started.

Judge Sullivan was cross-examined not only by the committeemen but by Mr. ELLENBOGEN and Mr. Sisson, and the following will show a fair sample:

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. You are trying to tell us that the school board is not doing its job, but the passage of this law will not correct that situation, because you want to revamp the school board. You cannot expect Congress to check on the school board; that is not its function. Don't forget this is a National Legislature.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We don't forget it.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. As a matter of fact, we do not have any business as a matter of local procedure to interfere with the school board. If the school board is not properly constituted, you ought to oppose it.

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have facts to show that that rider was both necessary and warranted.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. I understand you believe that.

Mr. KENNEDY. This book is used by the authority of whom?

Mr. SULLIVAN. On the recommendation of the superintendent with the authority of the Board of Education, who originally selected it.

Mr. KENNEDY. And subsequently it was prohibited; is that correct?

Mr. SULLIVAN. It was thrown out after 11 months.

Mr. KENNEDY. By whom?

Mr. SULLIVAN. By the Board of Education upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools.

Mr. KENNEDY. Assuming that you did not or you did have this rider to the appropriation bill, that action should have been taken regardless of that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. It should have been; but the point was that it would not have been.

Mr. KENNEDY. How do you know that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We are showing you the facts upon which you can draw your own conclusion.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do you mean to contend that they prohibited this book after the so-called rider was placed on the appropriation bill?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Without the rider I think every person who studied this would be satisfied that that book would still be in, and it took Congress, the rider, plus the Comptroller General's action, plus the action and persistence of this federation, to get it out; and it only went out on the very day when we were demanding a hearing as to why we could not get a list of the textbooks used in the teachers' colleges.

I say those are the facts. We don't want to draw the conclusion, but we want to give you the facts so that each of you can draw your own conclusion.

Mr. SHORT. Can you tell us the number of teachers in Washington who are graduates or who attended the teachers' college at Columbia?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I could not give you the statistics.

Mr. SHORT. You do not know how many there are?

Mr. SULLIVAN. No.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Do you know whether this book is also in the other teachers' training colleges throughout the States?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I have no means of knowing that. We have no funds or facilities. All we have is given you, what we have dug out at great trouble here.

Now, in connection with that, the fact is that they have done that, and the responsibility has not been fixed for the selection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. How can the teachers tell the truth unless they discuss Russia?

Mr. SULLIVAN. We have not objected to the mention of Russia or communism; we have not objected to the telling of the facts, but we object to their telling them falsehoods and deceiving them as to what are the facts there.

Mr. SCHULTE. Where do you base your views on that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. In these books [indicating].

Mr. SCHULTE. Do you know of any particular instance where a teacher was advocating communism in the public schools of the District of Columbia?

Mr. SULLIVAN. As I have said before, I am not touching the teachers, I have not been in the classrooms and watching them.

Mr. SCHULTE. You have heard of teachers teaching communism in the schools of Washington, have you not?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; Senator KING has a letter from a Mrs. Dingley, who advised him that she had to withdraw her grandchild, and she is the daughter-in-law of Congressman Dingley. She advised Senator KING that she was compelled to withdraw her grandchild from the public schools and put her in the private schools because of the way other governments were being praised to the detriment of this country.

Mr. SCHULTE. How recent was that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. That letter was within the last 30 or 40 days.

Mr. Sisson. If I were in a court of law, I would object to that as a matter of pure hearsay.

Mr. SHORT. If you will permit me to state that Mr. Counts says in his book, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* on page 19 [reading]:

"My thesis is that complete impartiality is utterly impossible, that the school must shape attitudes, develop tastes, and even impose ideas."

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Sullivan, are not these teachers already as employees of the Federal Government required to take an oath to support the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Before this "red rider"?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Well, how does the "red rider" place upon them any higher allegiance than the oath to support the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I can answer that very readily; that oath of allegiance is a general oath to support and defend the Constitution. You cannot prosecute a person under that for some of the specific things here, such as the featuring of communism, describing it inaccurately and falsely to the pupils. You have got to make a showing which goes specifically to an attempt to overthrow our Government or our Constitution.

Mr. Sisson. It is not any more a general oath than my oath as a Member of Congress. That is specific. I am sworn.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Exactly.

Mr. Sisson. I am sworn to support the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So am I as a lawyer.

Mr. Sisson. What more do you want? Do you want them hanged and quartered? [Laughter.]

Mr. SULLIVAN. They are obeying the instructions of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools to follow the teachers' method books and the textbooks and the study magazines with the pupils, and if they do it they do not tell the pupils the truth about communism; they tell them falsehoods about communism, and they are winning them to communism all the time.

Mr. SCHULTE. You are making a blanket indictment there. You say they are telling? They are not telling them the truth?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I say these do not give the truth.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Sullivan, you know the members of the school board?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I know some of them by sight.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. They are ladies and gentlemen of the highest reputation, aren't they?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I cannot undertake to pass on them one way or the other. I am not reflecting upon their standing.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that I received the following complaint:

FEDERATION OF CITIZENS' ASSOCIATIONS,
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Re H. R. 11375—Sisson bill.

HON. THOMAS L. BLANTON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE BLANTON: While the proponents of the repeal bill were given the fullest opportunity, the proponents of the present law were limited, restricted, interrupted, and subjected to repeated harassments and discourtesies such as I have never before witnessed. These harassments and discourtesies were not only committed by members of the subcommittee, but also by others not on said subcommittee, notably Congressmen Sisson and ELLENBOGEN, who appeared to practically take charge of the hearing a large part of the time, and who seemed to consider it to be their function to insult those appearing in opposition to the repeal bill. The audience, which was composed largely of officers and teachers in the public schools, was encouraged by such harassments and discourtesies so emanating from the committee table to supplement the same by noisy demonstrations in the hearing room against those opposing said repeal bill, and such demonstrations were openly led by the principal of a junior high school without any attempt by the subcommittee or the Superintendent of Schools to deal with such offenders.

It requires a rather wide stretch of the imagination to say that the opponents of the repeal bill were really given any hearing. I went to the trouble, on behalf of said federation, of carrying before said subcommittee textbooks, study magazines, etc., in order that said subcommittee might see for itself, in the precise setting and context, the antipatriotic, procommunist, etc., matter which had been injected into the public schools here. I was not, however, permitted to make such presentation, the subcommittee stating that its time was too limited and then restricting me to the supplying of a written statement for the record covering the principal part of my subject matter. This was followed by the subcommittee, and also the main committee, reporting said repeal bill favorably in advance of the printing of the hearings, and, consequently, without any adequate opportunity for consideration of the matter submitted by me which the subcommittee refused to hear in its open session.

By reference to page 221 of said printed hearing you will see that Congressman Sisson expressly treated the Communist Party as on a par with the Democratic and Republican Parties, to which exception was taken by a Mr. AYERS, who said:

"I don't think the analogy is a good one. No good Democrat and no good Republican ever advocated the overthrow of this Government."

Those who are so solicitous about fairness to the Communist Party ought certainly to show a reasonable amount of fairness to this federation in this very matter in the public interest, if not justice to the federation itself.

Very truly yours,
GEO. E. SULLIVAN,
Chairman, Special Committee of Federation of Citizens' Associations of the District of Columbia on Elimination of Antipatriotic, etc., Matter from Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

I have a letter, Mr. Speaker, from Maj. Gen. Amos A. Fries stating that he was cross-examined, interrupted, heckled, and insulted until he was unable to make a connected statement. The following are a few of the questions:

Mr. SCHULTE. Do you believe in our form of government, General?

General FRIES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. General, how many Communists are there?

General FRIES. Well, I never tried to count them.

Mr. SCHULTE. Do you believe any of the teachers in the public schools are Communists?

General FRIES. Well, I have reason to think so.

Mr. SCHULTE. Either answer "yes" or "no." Either the fellow is or he is not.

General FRIES. In my opinion, he is.

Mr. SCHULTE. Now, will you give the school board the name of that particular individual, so that he may be investigated?

General FRIES. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTE. And if you find that that is not true, you will certainly avail yourself of the opportunity to defend this particular individual?

General FRIES. Yes.

Mr. SCHULTE. It is just hearsay on your part?

General FRIES. No.

Mr. SCHULTE. Then as an American citizen you have not availed yourself of the opportunity, as an outstanding leader of the District of Columbia, to find out whether that fellow is teaching communism.

General FRIES. I took the matter up with the Superintendent of Schools in 1926 and asked about it.

Mr. SCHULTE. Nine years ago?

General FRIES. I believe that the School Board and the School Superintendent are responsible for the way the teachers are not furnished with the other side of the information on communism; that they are furnished with the "good side" of communism, if there be such.

Mr. SCHULTE. What do you mean by "if there be such"? Both sides of the story?

General FRIES. No; I say "if there be such"—any good side to communism.

Mr. SCHULTE. How many Communists are there in the District of Columbia?

General FRIES. I think perhaps the police department might give you some estimate of that number.

Mr. SCHULTE. Have you availed yourself of the opportunity to observe to see how many there are in the District?

General FRIES. No; I am not interested in the exact number in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCHULTE. How do you feel about child labor?

General FRIES. I do not think it should be permitted.

Mr. SCHULTE. You believe in child labor?

General FRIES. No, sir; I am just as much opposed to hardships on children as any man living.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Have you read the books written by Karl Marx?

General FRIES. I have read a book entitled "The Manifesto."

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Have you read his books?

General FRIES. I have read parts of them.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Have you seen any part in his book where he talks about the nationalization of women?

General FRIES. Yes.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Which part?

General FRIES. You will find that, I think, probably on pages 28 and 29 of the particular copy that I have; and I will read you what I took from there on pages 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, and 31.

Mr. KENNEDY. Let me ask you, do you think Dr. Ballou is a proper man to head the public-schools system in the District of Columbia?

General FRIES. I think we could get a much better one.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do you think he is the right man for the position?

General FRIES. In my opinion, no.

Mr. SCHULTE. Do you believe in communism?

General FRIES. No, sir; I do not believe in giving autocratic power to any man.

Mr. SCHULTE. You are sure you do not lean toward the Communist idea?

General FRIES. If I ever thought so, I would bend myself back the other way.

Mr. Sisson. General, going back to the correspondence between Secretary of War Weeks and yourself with regard to child labor. You were at that time an acting commanding officer in the United States Army, were you not?

General FRIES. Yes, sir. That had nothing—

Mr. Sisson (interposing). Just a moment. Answer my question, please. And, as such, you lent yourself to the opposition to the abolition of child labor in this country, did you not?

General FRIES. I did not in connection with that chart at all.

Mr. Sisson. That is not what I am asking you about, the chart. You were opposed to the abolition of child labor, and you made statements to the effect that you were opposed to the abolition of child labor by the Federal Government?

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I hope and pray that whenever the "sissy bill", which seeks to repeal the law against communism, is taken up in the House that it will be snowed under by an overwhelming vote, in protection to the 99,000 school children in this Nation's Capital.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOEHNE, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HANCOCK of North Carolina, for several days, on account of illness in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2286. An act providing for the allocation of net revenues of the Shoshone power plant of the Shoshone reclamation project in Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 9244. An act providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida at Panama City, Fla.; and

H. R. 10193. An act to amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), in accordance with its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until Monday, May 4, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. S. 2737. An act authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a suitable terminal marker for the Jefferson Davis National Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 2575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 12240. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the tributaries, sources, and headwaters of the Allegheny and Susquehanna Rivers in the State of Pennsylvania where no examination and survey has heretofore been made, with a view to the adoption of a comprehensive and systematic plan for regulating the flow of water, conserving the soil and water for beneficial uses, and controlling and preventing floods, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. S. 4228. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Salmon River in the State of Oregon with a view to the control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. S. 4355. An act to authorize a preliminary examination of the Delaware River with a view to the control of its floods; without amendment (Rept. No. 2578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12525) granting a pension to R. G. Bunton, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CULKIN: A bill (H. R. 12554) authorizing an examination and survey of the Black and Moose Rivers and their tributaries in Herkimer, Lewis, Jefferson, Oneida, and Hamilton Counties, N. Y.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H. R. 12555) to repeal the prohibition on insurance by the Federal Housing Administration of improvement loans (\$2,000-limit class) involving the purchase and installation of equipment and machinery; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 12556) to create the Treasury Agency Service, to provide for the more adequate protection of the revenue and a more effective enforcement of the revenue and other laws administered by the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KELLER: A bill (H. R. 12557) to provide for a term of court at Benton, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 12558) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to convey the Norfolk Army base terminal to the city of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 12559) to create a commission to enter into negotiations with respect to the refunding of certain obligations of foreign governments held by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12560) to provide full compensation to workers, farmers, and businessmen for losses suffered in the flood occurring in western Pennsylvania in March 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H. R. 12561) for the erection of a public building at Picayune, Pearl River County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 502) for the consideration of H. R. 11369; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 503) for the consideration of S. 4020; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts supporting House bill 12164; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: A bill (H. R. 12562) granting a pension to Margaret K. Pierce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12563) for the relief of the legal representatives of O. M. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12564) granting a pension to Mildred A. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 12565) authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to establish a fish-cultural station in Minnesota; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 12566) for the relief of Michael Joseph Greeley; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON: A bill (H. R. 12567) for the relief of Percy C. Wright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN: A bill (H. R. 12568) for the relief of William Scott; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12569) for the relief of W. C. Stringer; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12570) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to reappoint Arthur E. Koch as a chaplain in the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12571) granting a pension to Caleb J. Ledford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GINGERY: A bill (H. R. 12572) for the relief of Albert W. Chase; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 12573) for the relief of Dr. E. T. Kirkendall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 12574) for the relief of the Michigan Valve & Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT of New York: A bill (H. R. 12575) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of George Cabot et al., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

10816. By Mr. McCORMACK: Resolution of the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, John J. Crim, national legislative chairman, 1314 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., unanimously endorsing the Kramer and McCormack bills on un-American activities; to the Committee on Rules.

10817. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Resolution of the New York City Housing Authority, endorsing the bill to provide financial assistance to the States and political subdivisions thereof for the elimination of unsafe and insanitary housing conditions, for the development of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, and for the reduction of unemployment and the stimulation of business activity, to create a United States Housing Authority, and for other purposes, introduced in the Senate by the Honorable ROBERT F. WAGNER, United States Senator from New York, and in the House of Representatives by the Honorable HENRY ELLENBOGEN, Congressman from Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

10818. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mary F. Needham and 36 other citizens of Eugene, Oreg., urging the enactment of House bill 8739; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

10819. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Rotary Club of Somerset, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

10820. Also, petition of the Housing Authorities of the State of New York; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 4, 1936

(Legislative day of Friday, Apr. 24, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, April 30, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1432) to amend section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, generally known as the War Minerals Relief Statutes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10193) to amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 231) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Swedes in Delaware, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8599) to provide for a change in the designation of the Bureau of Navigation and Steamboat Inspection, to create a marine casualty investigation board, and increase efficiency in administration of the steamboat inspection laws, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLAND, Mr. SIROVICH, Mr. RAMSPECK, Mr. LEHLBACH, and Mr. WELCH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10267) to provide for adjusting the compensation of division superintendents, assistant division superintendents, assistant superintendents at large, assistant superintendents in charge of car construction, chief clerks, assistant chief clerks, and clerks in charge of sections in offices of division superintendents in the Railway Mail Service, to correspond to the rates established by the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BURCH, Mr. HILDEBRANDT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. DOUTRICH, and Mr. GOODWIN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11688. An act providing for a change in the design of the 50-cent pieces authorized to be coined in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Arkansas into the Union; and

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 9244. An act providing for the establishment of a term of the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Florida at Panama City, Fla.; and

H. R. 10193. An act to amend the act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Copeland	La Follette	Overton
Ashurst	Couzens	Lewis	Pittman
Austin	Davis	Logan	Pope
Bachman	Dieterich	Loneragan	Reynolds
Barbour	Donahey	Long	Robinson
Barkley	Duffy	McAdoo	Russell
Black	Frazier	McGill	Schwellenbach
Bone	George	McKellar	Sheppard
Bulkeley	Gerry	McNary	Shipstead
Bulow	Gibson	Maloney	Steiwer
Burke	Glass	Metcalf	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Guffey	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Hale	Moore	Townsend
Capper	Harrison	Murphy	Vandenberg
Caraway	Hatch	Murray	Van Nuys
Carey	Hayden	Neely	Wagner
Chavez	Johnson	Norris	Walsh
Connally	Keyes	Nye	Wheeler
Coolidge	King	O'Mahoney	White